NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 18. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 226.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy, } Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

"The Peculiar Institution."

KIDNAPPING.

Another villanous attempt was made on last Friday evening during the rain, in the early part of the night, to kidnap two colored men, by two unknown scoundrels, who, if they had their just deserts, would be confined to the penitentiary for life.

Those rebels came into our city, and put up at *Bell's Eagle Tavern*, in Liberty street, opposite Hand, and reported, as we learn, that they were in search of two fugitives. Going out that night, they seized upon two colored men who live on "the Hill," and wanted to force them to go to Bell's tavern with them. The men refused, but stated they would go to a 'Squire's office, and probably would have proven too much for the scoundrels, but they, each with pistol in hand, compelled them to go to an Alderman's office, which proved to be Esquire Scully's in the Diamond, who refused to have anything to do with the case, but told them to go to the Mayor's office, when, on coming out, our good old friend, Mr. M'—— interfered, on which the fiends fled, leaving the colored men; and as no officer could be obtained that night, they left the city in the morning early.

These land pirates and base kidnappers, are continually prowling about in the free States, and it behooves every colored man to be on the alert—remember that "the price of liberty, is eternal *vigilance!*" We say, defend yourselves in the way it seemeth you best, so that you spare the *lives* of these base villains.—*Pittsburgh Mystery.*

A SLAVE AUCTION.

A correspondent of the Freeman's Advocate and Journal, travelling in Louisiana, and who is no Abolitionist, gives the following account of an auction held at Raymond, near Vicksburg:

It is the practice here for the Sheriff to sell property on which executions have been levied, in front of the Court-House, on the first day of the session of the court, and the citizens of the county in great numbers generally assemble on that day. Among the property to be sold on this occasion, were some twenty or thirty men, women, and children, taken in satisfaction of execution by the Sheriff, and I saw the effects of Slavery in a new form. A young woman was first placed upon the bench, in the midst of the crowd, well dressed, modest, and neat in her appearance, and recommended as a good house servant, and sold for $500; and another, in a condition which ought to have prevented her exposure, was presented to the public gaze, and sold for about the same sum. A man, about forty years of age, described as an excellent blacksmith, well skilled in his trade, was then sold; and immediately after him, his wife and three little children were placed upon the stand, and a scene of most painful interest ensued. Finding the gentleman who had become his purchaser, he urged him with most anxious solicitude to buy his family; and as the bids for his wife and children were received successively from different persons by the Sheriff, and the chances of a separation seemed to preponderate, his countenance indicated a heart swelling with painful emotions; and as if he could not endure the probable fate which awaited him, he again spoke to his new master, recounting the valuable qualities of his wife. The bids already made by others were regarded excessive, and his purchaser refusing to raise upon the sum offered, the fatal words, "Three times, and gone," announced his separation from the object of his affection, by their becoming the property of another. As they came down from the stand, he advanced to his wife with a downcast look, and remarked, "Well, Sally, we are separated;" an annunciation which at once drew tears from her eyes. Seeing their feelings, the purchaser of the man—a gentleman of high character, and whose bid was made without a knowledge that he had a family—immediately announced to the Sheriff his wish to relinquish his purchase, assigning as a reason his unwillingness to be the means of separating the man from his family, and presuming that the owner of the woman and children would, on a second sale, become his purchaser. He was again put upon the stand, but there were those present in whose hearts there was no sympathy for revered affections, to the sacrifice of the chance of a favorable purchase of a valuable blacksmith, and the re-sale only inflicted new pangs in the bosoms of this family, by the revival and disappointment of new hopes. He was again struck off as the purchase of another.

A woman, with two children, one an infant in her arms, were then sold; and then two other children of the same mother, a little boy and a little girl, were sold separately, amid the affecting cries of the mother at the thought of parting with her children. A little girl, about thirteen years old, and nearly as white as any one present, was then placed upon the platform, and struck off to the highest bidder at $350. The sale continued till these human beings were all sold to satisfy the demands of execution creditors. Let it not be supposed that these consequences of existing laws find approbation among the virtuous and respectable part of this community; for it is not so. In speaking of this scene with the freedom of an independent citizen, I found my own feelings painful, not to say indignant, and to be in unison with those of every respectable gentleman with whom I conversed; and I doubt not, from what I saw and heard, that any well-informed gentleman, in the spirit of an American Freeman and a Christian, could have addressed the assembled multitude in condemnation of the cause of such results, with the concurrence of nine-tenths of all present. Although the law sanctions it, public sentiment condemns the separationof families, and it is only men of loose principles or profligate characters that will be the occasion of doing it. The truth is, the idea of one man being the absolute property of another, and subject to all the incidents of property, is so revolting to human nature in a state even of partial refinement, that it is only when goaded by extravagant provocations that its justification will ever be attempted. The division of society into castes, and the subjecting one to the obligation of perpetual service to the other, is one thing; but the recognition in one of the right of property in the other, is quite another thing. Slavery, as a domestic relation, making one race the servants of the other on such terms as that the personal right and obligations of both parties are recognized by law, might by many be defended; but the recognition of property in human flesh, bones, and sinews, to the exclusion of every personal right, is too revolting to humanity to admit even of an apology, in a community where civilization, not to say Christianity, has shed its rays.

Pro-Slavery.

From the Liberty Press.

"ALAS FOR GERRIT SMITH! CURSED BE LIBERTY PARTY!"

We need no better evidence that Gerrit Smith's vindication of the Constitution is doing a good work, than the malignity it is bringing down upon his head from the "Non-Resistants" of the Garrison school. The above exclamation is from a Review of Mr. Smith's Constitutional argument, by Wendell Phillips, in the Liberator of the 6th instant. "*Cursed be Liberty party!*" And to this, the *slaveholders* will say "Amen!" The politicians, rallied under their respective slaveholding candidates, will say "Amen!" The infernal regions will respond amen to the "curses" of Mr. Phillips. But then, the "curses" of Mr. Phillips, are but the innocent thunderings of "Non-Resistant" wrath, which, like a kicking musket, will do the worst execution on their ill-natured author.

Not content with "curses" upon the Liberty party, Mr. Smith's intelligence, candor, and morality are all questioned, all disputed, by Mr. Phillips.

I have too much respect for Gerrit's head to think he believes his own argument. It reminds me,—comparing little things with great,—of what the English said of Webster's letter to Everett; "He tries hard to persuade others that he believes his own argument."

Very generous (isn't it?) to honor Mr. Smith's "head," with a view to rob him of *common honesty!*

Let Gerrit Smith first pay his proportion of debts which he and I incurred together, and which he and his friends, first pocketing the partnership fund, have left me to meet, before he plumes himself so much on their virtue, as not to find time to inquire into the charges which such men as Edmund Quincy bring against them.

Very modest, too, after Mr. Smith has given fifty thousand dollars to sustain the American Anti-Slavery Society, to call on him for further aid to support a Society which has been prostituted to objects foreign to the one for which it was originally founded! The charge on Mr. Smith of "pocketing partnership funds," is a base falsehood, without the least excuse: Again:

I find it difficult to believe that so intelligent a man as Gerrit Smith, was honest when he penned that paragraph. It might have been done years ago, but not now. Hume, you remember, when speaking of Strafford's change from the Puritan party to King Charles' side, for which he was rewarded with an Earldom, says—"He *may have* been honest in his conversion, but it would require a life of uninterrupted consistency afterwards, to convince us that he was so." So I say of Smith's use of this argument. "He may believe it sound, but it will require a life of uninterrupted stupidity hereafter, to convince us that he does."

Mr. Phillips has a hundred-fold more to do with Mr. Smith's "intelligence," and honesty, than he has with his *argument!* Why is this? It is because *denunciation* has become the logic of the Boston clique, who govern the American Anti-Slavery Society. Their *word* has become the law. Hence, Mr. Phillips, as one of the "privileged class," clothed with the orthodoxy of "Old Organization," does not attempt to answer Mr. Smith's *arguments*, but spends his article in an effort to ridicule his intelligence, and to bring into contempt his morality!

We give another extract:

Next follows a fine specimen of morality.

I am aware, (he says,) that a Colony, on coming into our Union, acquired a more efficient protection for its commerce, than it before enjoyed. Let this incidental advantage (!) to the African slave-trade—this incidental security (!) to it—pass for what it is worth toward giving a pro-slavery character to the anti-slavery agreement under consideration!!

That is, *little sins* are of no consequence! The same idea peeps out immediately afterwards. Speaking of the clause about fugitives, he says: "Even under the pro-slavery construction of this provision, it can, Constitutionally, operate but *little (!)* in favor of slavery."

Probably the town scales of Peterboro' are not nice enough to weigh small sins. Perhaps New-York morality, like the law, "does not care for trifles." If this be so, it explains Mr. Smith's justification of his friend Tappan's *little peccadilloes.*

Whether Mr. Smith will get "the Peterboro' scales" sealed up by the Boston standard, poised so self-complacently in the hands of this hater of the Liberty party, we shall not say—but claim the privilege of a doubt. Mr. Smith needs no defence at our hands. We allude to this matter merely to show the spirit of our enemies, and the wicked means they can employ for our injury. We have no fears for their "curses," but pity their blind infatuation; and the more so since it partakes so largely of *obstinacy*, and a malignant sectarian spirit.

SIGNS.—The National Anti-Slavery Standard is filled up every week with long articles from David Lee Child, urging Abolitionists to vote for Clay; and the Liberator is repeating the contemptible slander of the Whigs, that the Liberty papers secretly favor the election of Polk. These developments will open the eyes of Abolitionists, and though not especially creditable to those who make them, they cannot fail to advance the cause of Liberty, and produce that kind of anti-slavery action which Mr. Clay and his brother slaveholders consider "the more fearful.—*Granite Freeman.*

From the New-York Observer.

A SCENE IN A SYNOD.

It was in the Autumn of 1834, that the venerable Synod of New Jersey, held its sessions in the ancient and time honored Borough of Elizabeth. But few larger or more learned ecclesiastical bodies meet in this country. Embracing within its limits two colleges, and the principal Theological Seminary of the Church, and covering a large territory where Presbyterianism has been long established, it numbers among its members, some of the ablest scholars, professors, theologians, and civilians in America. On the occasion to which we now allude it presented an imposing spectacle. There were venerable doctors in theology whose gray hairs were at once to them a crown of glory and the ornament of the Assembly—there were the president and professors of Princeton and Lafayette Colleges, with not merely an American but a European reputation, there were the venerated pastors of a hundred churches and elders, from the eloquent Senator through the various grades of civil and social life, down to the plain but pious farmer.

During a momentary pause in the business of this venerable and learned body an aged and highly respected clergyman arose, stating that he wished to present a few resolutions to the consideration of the Synod. His age and well-earned character obtained for him a kindly hearing. His resolutions were on the subject of Abolitionism and in its favor, and in opposition to Colonization. A few well directed remarks fell from their mover, after which he took his seat.

The Synod looked as if taken by surprise, and none seemed disposed to touch the exciting subject. The Moderator was about rising to put the motion, which would have resulted in their rejection by an overwhelming vote without a word being said, when he was arrested by the words, "Mr. Moderator," slowly but emphatically pronounced. in a moment all was breathless attention. For about half an hour the Synod hung upon the lips of the speaker. Such an exposition of Abolitionism, and of the blessings of Colonization, the aged ones never heard before; nor the more youthful ones since. It was a torrent of eloquence irresistible in argument, and most affectionate and winning in its spirit and manner. When he sat down enough was said. The flowing tears of many of the gray headed ones showed the emotions that possessed their soule. The Moderator waited for some time to give opportunity to others to speak, but not a word was uttered. The motion was put on the adoption of the resolutions, and the mover *only* voted for them; whilst the whole Synod besides voted against them. And we have never had an Abolition resolution presented to the Synod since.

The mover of the resolutions was the excellent Dr. Weeks, of Newark; their opposer, was THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN, of the United States. And this scene in a Synod will never be forgotten by many who witnessed it. S. Y.

The Church.

CINCINNATI PRESBYTERY—GILMER vs. GRAHAM.

Presbytery met at Oxford, September 3d, and adjourned at twelve or one o'clock on the morning of the 8th. It was occupied mainly with the trial of Rev. William Graham, on charges of "heresy and error," preferred by Rev. Daniel Gilmer, of Ripley Presbytery.

Throughout the trial, with the exception of some passages of the defence, the whole debate was conducted in a kind, serious, and Christian spirit; and the results, obvious and immediate, were the shedding of a vast amount of light upon the question of Slavery, and the duty of the Church.

Dr. CLAYBAUGH, President of the Associate Reformed Theological Seminary, who, a few years since introduced the resolutions for extirpating slavery from the Reformed "Synod of the West," attended during a large part of the discussions.

Mr. Graham moved the Presbytery to invite Dr. Junkin to sit as a corresponding member of the body; but as he has lately published a book similar to the one on which Mr. Graham then stood for trial at the bar of the Presbytery, the obvious impropriety of inviting him to sit in judgment upon his own published sentiments struck every one; so that the motion did not even get a second. Nevertheless, the Doctor sat by the accused, giving him such countenance and counsel as he deemed important.

Dr. BISHOP, Dr. SCOTT, and other literary men and ministers were in attendance, and were invited to sit; some belonging to the New School, others to the Old.

Mr. Gilmer opened the case with a speech of considerable length—a kind and Christian spirit, and great force of natural, home-bred sense. He has promised to write out his pleadings in short numbers for the "Watchman." I invited Rev. Mr. Graham to do the same with his defence; but he declined, on the ground that he intends publishing it by itself.

Mr. Graham occupied in his defence about a day and a half. He had a hundred or two pages of manuscript, which he read, stopping to comment when he thought necessary. He admitted the specifications made by brother Gilmer, and attempted to justify them against the charge of "heresy and error."

For the most part, his defence was characterized by respectable ability and entire frankness. The display of learning might have been somewhat diminished had he recollected that he was pleading before men who know how easy it is, by the help of a common Lexicon, to find the word "*doulos*," in the works of Xenophon and Herodotus. And his declaration that he was "dragged" into the debate in Synod, last October, when he first uttered his pamphlet, would have excited more pity, had it not been known that he had spent months before Synod, in preparing for that very debate, into which he was so forcibly and suddenly "*dragged*;" and that he actually carried his written speech to the Synod, and read it from his manuscript.

But he frankly admitted the truth of the charges, and uttered an enlarged edition of the pamphlet on which he was tried, which declares that the relation of master and slave "*was a part of the laws of Jehovah*"—that consequently, neither the words nor the spirit of the gospel stand opposed to this relation—that it was so a part of the Abrahamic covenant that those who teach the sinfulness of the relation destroy that covenant—that, in short, "the Head of the Church has authorized it in the charter of the Church, and in all the laws ever made for its regulation."

Mr. GILMER replied in a masterly manner. Showing that God governed Judea—a spot amid a world of slaveholding heathen nations, under the law, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. 21. 16. He examined the passages adduced by the accused, and proved them all to be in perfect consistency with this fundamental law, which forbid to make or hold a man a slave. And that not only did God expel the property-holding of men from the spot of the earth which He governed in person, but he forbid the Israelites to return the fugitive slaves from surrounding tribes, who had fled into God's land—that thus the whole land of Judea was one great city of refuge, with all its gates wide opened by the command of God, into which the stricken and crushed of surrounding nations, seen by the election of God, might rush at once, both to personal safety and the knowledge of salvation.

When the pleadings were closed, the members of Presbytery, being called, gave their

JUDICIAL OPINIONS.

All but one, both ministers and elders, decided that the accused taught manifest and hurtful errors. And the elder who gave a contrary opinion, confessed when he rose, that he had never read the pamphlet on which the accused was tried. Some were in doubt whether the errors taught were properly and technically "*heresy*," but though that point was but little and imperfectly dwelt on in the discussion, a majority were of opinion that it was "heresy," and some who did not give it that designation, yet stated, that an "error" might infer the like judicial treatment with a "heresy," where the case was aggravated.

DR. BEECHER, the first on the roll, in giving his judgment, made a speech which may be best judged by the description given of it by a plain, uneducated man, who stood talking near the meeting-house after its delivery. Said he:

"The Doctor took up the world—held it up before him, and philosophized upon it. At length, he saw a dark black speck of slavery coming into it, and demolished it out of the earth with a single blow."

I had taken notes of his speech, intending to write it out for the Watchman; but as the case is to be argued anew in Synod, I have thought not best to do so. He said, "God never made a slave *in* or *from* the womb." "No man, therefore, is born a slave." "Slavery, is not, therefore, a part of God's universal scheme, established for the government of mankind." "It is not from God, but is the fruit of human wickedness and usurpation." "The truth is, slavery never did exist a moment without sin, and never will." "God has not set up government among men, and then established another force adequate (slavery) to knock it down."

"Do you suppose the Abrahamic bond-service was compulsory, involuntary slavery? Do you suppose Abraham had to get cords upon the slaves of the surrounding heathen, and drag them over the line, poor creatures! to circumcise them and environ them with God's mercies under the law of love! No, no. It was not Slavery. It is a mockery to call it so."

This last was an allusion to Mr. Graham's published sentiment, that God required Abraham to "enforce" circumcision upon his "male slaves." Dr. Beecher finished his remarks, (which were listened to with profound stillness throughout,) in the afternoon, after recess for dinner, and concluded with observing that, in his judgment, teaching that God has established slaveholding as one of the Scriptural and divinely authorized relations of life, is an error "which infers admonition, censure, and, when incorrigibly persevered in, suspension from the ministry."

Dr. ROBINSON said, "God punishes wicked men in justice, but he never *degrades man.* He never marked him a *slave.* He never makes man an accountable being, and then puts him into a condition where he cannot exercise his accountability. The very lost in hell are not slaves. They suffer there in the dignity and doom of rational, accountable creatures who have sinned, and continue to sin, freely and of choice."

Dr. CLEAVELAND spoke with great beauty, clearness, and force. The accused had quoted an array of commentators as teaching his doctrines respecting Slavery. Dr. C. took up two of those brought forward by Mr. Graham, and read one from Doctor Scott, that "The Gospel when carried out to its consequences, must necessarily abolish Slavery;" and from another, Dr. A. Clark, that trading in slaves "was a crime for which Perdition had scarcely an adequate punishment."

Dr. C. then took the Hebrew Bible and read that oft quoted passage: "*They shall be your bondmen forever;*"—*Lev.* 25. 46; and showed, by a most triumphant critical argument, that the fair meaning of the phrase in our English Bibles, is just what the most rigid translation of the Hebrew text yields: viz:—"*Forever, or always shall ye obtain your servants of them;*" to wit: from among the heathen nations. A translation, by the way, which Dr. Claybaugh says, is, in substance the very same which he gives to his classes in theology.

Dr. Cleaveland then closed with relating the views of an intelligent and educated lawyer, who, in death, asked the forgiveness of his colored man; and referred to the cause of the enslaved, which he had once derided, in terms of penitent regret for his course. The nature of the facts stated, and the simplicity and force with which they were uttered, embodying the testimony of one from the opening portals of eternity, was such as to produce a great sensation in the house; and there were many wet eyes when Dr. C. sat down.

Prof. ALLEN, being Moderator, and of course, having arranged no formal expression of opinion, simply observed that though he would not then undertake to decide that the slaveholding relation was sin in all conceivable cases; yet, if the accused would only commence and keep on removing the evils of slavery, when he had plucked the last evil away, he would find that not the ghost of the thing would remain.

Mr. MILLS agreed that the pamphlet contained errors, but thought there were mitigating circumstances in Mr. Graham's case.

Mr. BUSHNELL insisted, with great clearness and force of expression, that the pamphlet contained most dangerous and destructive errors, which the Presbytery could not innocently suffer the accused to teach by its authority.

Mr. BRAINERD spoke warmly against Slavery, as the great corruptor of religion, and destroyer of souls, in this and in heathen countries.

Mr. BLANCHARD spoke to two points:—that the slaveholding relation is sinful: and that teaching that God has authorized it in the Church is heresy.

After quoting the pamphlet, in Mr. Graham's words, that this relation "*was a part of the laws of Jehovah,*" and recognized and authorized as such in the New Testament Church; "authorized by the Head of the Church," &c. &c.; Mr. B. argued that the relation itself is sinful:—

1st. Because the slaveholder cannot act in this relation, by using his slave as property, without doing what all see and confess to be sin. His first property-holding act is admitted to be sin, whether he sells, or uses his slave as property; and a relation in which no one can act without sinning is a sinful relation; as clearly as that fountain is poisonous, which, to keep it from poisoning the community, must be forever and perpetually dammed up.

In reply to the allegation, that the relation was not sinful in the hands of a kind master, who did not use his power to the prejudice of the slave, he urged that all could see, that if the simple property relation were to be admitted into the family of a member of the Presbytery, it immediately unmarries him from his wife; and sunders all the parental, filial, and fraternal ties, and thus proves utter antagonism to God's laws: and he urged, that the pretence that because a kind slaveholder would not use this property relation until compelled to do so by pressing circumstances, no more proved the property relation itself to be harmless, than the fact that the kind cannibal will not eat the man whom he holds in the food-relation, until driven to eat him by hunger, proves that food-relation to be in itself harmless, and without sin, until the cannibal begins to eat.

2d. Mr. B. argued, that the relation is sinful; because it is holding a *man* continually under a SLAVE'S liabilities, to wit: of suffering, sale, &c.

He denied, that purchasing a man to free him, or any such state, where another element, or other elements, are infused into this relation, so as to change its nature into that of redemption, or some like benevolent relation, can be called the "relation of master and slave," without a manifest perversion of speech.

3d. He argued, that the sinfulness of the slaveholding relation was established by all who had affirmed that it did not come from God. For there are two kinds of relations among men, holy and sinful: as marriage, and concubinage; the combinations of pirates, and partnerships in business; the relation of compensated service, and Slavery. And as but one of these two classes of relations is set up by God, to wit: holy relation, denying to Slavery the sanction of God's authority, is deciding it to belong to the sinful class.

In the second place—

Mr. B. defined heresy, from Schleusner, Poole, and Bloomingfield, to be "*Any doctrine opposed to, or inconsistent with the fundamental truths of the Gospel.*"

He then showed, that the law authorizing the property relation between two men, is simple abrogation and repeal of the last six commandments in the Decalogue, as between the holder and the held; and that which thus destroys all the fundamental gospel relation of life is, if anything can be, a fundamental error, or "heresy" in religion.

Mr. WHITE showed clearly, from the Discipline, chap. 5, sec. 13, that the errors which all had admitted to be taught in Mr. Graham's pamphlet, could be nothing less than, and nothing other than "heresy:" since it cannot be pretended that they do not "*strike* at the vitals of religion," or, that they arise "from the weakness of the human understanding;" or that they "are not likely to do much injury."

I will notice the speeches of others next week. The result to which Presbytery came, will be seen in the published minutes.

With an earnest and solemn purpose to maintain the truth, there appeared in Presbytery a laudable reluctance to pass finally upon the accused, and an earnest desire that he may review and remove the occasion of stumbling, which he has laid in the Church.—*Watchman of the Valley.*

Here is the conclusion to which the Presbytery came in this notable trial, which occupied three long days. How long will it take the brethren of the Committee to convince this reverend defender of the sum of all scoundrelism, that stealing children, and robbing men and women, isn't exactly the kind of religion that Jesus meant to establish? And failing in this, how much longer will it be, before the Synod will deem him a fit case for extreme unction? In my unregenerate and carnal state—deeming it a thing to thank God for that I never belonged to the pro-slavery Church—all this seems to me like very irreverent and ridiculous trifling. If the "erring brother" had defended the abstract right of robbing hen-roosts, would so "great and dangerous an error," have had a three days' trial, and all this ridiculous circumstance of reference to Synods and Committees?

Presbytery then adopted the following as their present action, in the case, viz: Whereas, this Presbytery find that the pamphlet of William Graham does contain sundry great and dangerous errors, demanding their deliberate attention, therefore—

Resolved, That this whole case be referred to Synod, for their final adjudication; and—

Whereas, we are required to use all proper efforts to reclaim an erring brother, therefore—

Resolved, That a committee of Conference be now appointed to labor with the accused.

Messrs. Beecher, Cleaveland, Mills, and Bushnell, were appointed said committee.

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

This body at its recent Anniversary Meeting, held in Worcester adopted the following Report on Slavery.

At four o'clock, business was resumed at the South church. Rev. Dr. WOODS, from the special committee on the subject of Slavery, made the following report, which was adopted *nem. diss.*

The petitions alluded to are three, two of them without date. They have all been received since the commencement of the meeting in this place. One of them is from members of the Unitarian church in Fitchburg, signed by Rev. Philo Pettibone and 52 others, making in the whole 24 males and 29 females. The next is from 10 members of John-street church, Lowell. The third is from Rev. J. C. Lovejoy, Jacob Ide, and ten other highly respectable members of the Board in this State, and seven laymen. In the first and second petitions above mentioned, this Board are requested and urged to take measures to prevent receiving into the treasury any moneys contributed in one way or another by slaveholders, or any of the avails of slavelabor. In the one from Fitchburg, we are desired also to pass resolutions, declaring American Slavery a sin against God and man, and ought to be immediately abolished, and that we will not employ missionaries or agents who are slaveholders.

In regard to the above request as to missionaries and agents, this Committee are not able to find what reason the petitioners can have for making such a request, as it is not known that there is at present any complaint, or any ground of complaint against the doings of the Board or their missionaries or agents. We did suppose that the particular and full information which has been given of late on this subject is and must be satisfactory to the friends of the cause in which we are engaged.

As to the other subjects touched upon in those two petitions, that is, the declarations we are requested to make as to Slavery, and as to the measures we are requested to adopt, the Committee are unable to recommend anything more, and they think the Board would not be inclined to do anything more than to refer the petitioners to the reports which have been made and unanimously accepted on the same subjects at previous meetings. In those reports, the Board have set forth as plainly as possible, the views they entertain on these subjects, and the principles which have governed their proceedings. They have stated, what is never to be forgotten, that the Board was established and incorporated for the express purpose of propagating the gospel in heathen lands, by supporting missionaries and diffusing a knowledge of the Scriptures; that the Board have confined themselves to this one GREAT OBJECT, and that a regard to our sacred trust requires us to pursue the object with undivided zeal, and not to turn aside from it or mix any other concerns with it. And we still think that the Lord of missions and the Saviour of the world will approve of this deliberate purpose of ours, and this course of action, and would frown upon us if we should depart from it; and we have the comfort to believe also that this is the only proposed course of action which will give permanent satisfaction to the Christian community who are interested in the cause of missions, being fully persuaded that any essential departure from this plan of operation would tend to defeat the great end we are pursuing, the conversion of the heathen.

As to the moneys contributed by slaveholders it is still our opinion, that considering the character of the Board and the nature of the objects, it may fairly be presumed that the funds contributed to our Treasury are obtained in a proper manner and contributed from right motives, and that it is very manifest that we cannot properly examine into the motives of those who sustain our operations, and that an attempt to do this would be marked with absurdity, and be attended with difficulties from which we could not be easily extricated.

It will not, we trust, be overlooked, that in reply to previous petitions, the Board has repeatedly and very frankly declared that they can *sustain no relation to Slavery which implies approbation of the system, and as a Board, can have no connection or sympathy with it.* Plainly intimating that we consider it one of the obvious evils which exist in the community, but the removal of which, though we regard it as an object of fervent desire and prayer, does not fall within our province as a missionary Board. We know not how any man who considers the subject can desire more than this. And it is quite certain, that without a change of views, the Board can do nothing beyond this.

The Prudential Committee, the Secretaries, and the members of the Board, are manifestly enlisted in one of the greatest, most benevolent, and most successful enterprises ever undertaken by man. We glory in the Cross of Christ, we glory in that work of the salvation of men, and the approaching conversion of the world, which depends upon that cross, and results from it. We most heartily invite churches to unite with us, and shall thank and honor all who help to sustain this pious undertaking, and who contribute of their property and their prayers to aid this blessed cause. With any of our brethren who are dissatisfied with our doings, we can have no controversy or contention. We cannot turn aside from our arduous work for the purpose of strife, and our Lord forbids us to engage in strife. If any of our dear brethren soberly think they can do the will of God, and advance his cause in some other way better than by joining their efforts with ours, we will be so far from complaining of them for following their own convictions, that we will pray God to guide them by wisdom from above, and will rejoice in all they do to spread the Gospel of Christ.

The last petition above mentioned, refers to a new subject, that is, the existence of slavery among some missionary churches, particularly among the Choctaws and other Indian tribes, and requests that the Board would take measures to ascertain the facts in the case. In conformity with this request, the Committee have made use of all the means in their power, and some of them of special importance, in order to ascertain these facts. And so far as they are at present informed, they see no reason to charge the missionaries among the Choctaws, or anywhere else, with either a violation or neglect of duty. But it has been impossible in so short a time to obtain that exact and complete information on the subject which is indispensably necessary to a full and satisfactory report. The Committee, for the reason suggested, ask the Board to receive what is now offered as their report, in part, on the above mentioned memorials, and request that they may have time to make a thorough inquiry into the state of the churches in our various missionary stations, in regard to Slavery, and with the help of the information thus obtained, to prepare a report on this part of the subject committed to them, to be presented to the Board at their next annual meeting. And may the Lord grant, that on this, and on every subject relating to the high and holy work of the world's conversion, all who love the name of Jesus may be of the same mind and judgment, and love one another with pure hearts fervently.

Selections.

GLASGOW EMANCIPATION SOCIETY.

The Glasgow Emancipation Society held its tenth annual meeting on the 1st of August. The following speech was made by the Reverend Doctor Burns. It is a most miserable apology for the course pursued by himself and his coadjutor while in this country, and shows most palpably a great ignorance of the present position of affairs here. It is a very easy thing to make moving speeches in Scotland on Slavery, where abolition has become almost, if not quite, a mere canting pretence of piety, but these men are very apt to lay down the cross as too heavy a one for their carrying when they reach this country:

The Chairman then introduced Dr. Burns of Paisley, to the meeting, expressing at the same time, the great admiration which he entertained for the eminent services of the Rev. Doctor in the cause.

Dr. BURNS said, I felt it to be my duty, and I felt it to be my privilege, and an honorable privilege, to obey the invitation your Secretaries respectfully addressed to me, to attend your meeting this evening. I felt it to be my duty to contribute anything in my power to help on a cause that has ever been dear to my heart; and returning, as I have lately done from the Western world, though I may not have much to communicate that is absolutely new, and speaking as I do in the presence of those much better acquainted with America than any one of the deputation from our Church can be, still I feel that it is my duty to stand up here, and to bear my testimony in favor of the great principles for which you have so long and so honorably contended. And the very day on which you called me to meet with you, the first of August, that was enough to carry a powerful appeal to my heart. No man who is a lover of liberty, and a lover of the best interests of humanity, can look upon the annual return of the first of August without emotions of gratitude to God, and of affectionate regard to the philanthropic men who are engaged in effecting the consummation of which that first of August is the mark, and the periodical memorial. (Cheers.) There is something peculiarly delightful in our meeting here this evening in the city of Glasgow, that was so long marked by a course of procedure very different indeed from what has been the distinguishing feature in your conduct, and in your proceedings as an Emancipation Society. (Loud cheering.) Met here in circumstances so interesting, we can look back to the period when hope and fear mingled in regard to the question of Emancipation; we can look back now through the series of years during which the experiment of freedom has been tried, and during which the question as to all the evils and terrible horrors that were predicted to follow from emancipation have been put to the test of actual experiment; and we can rejoice that our brethren, (for I love to call them brethren, seeing that of one blood God made all the nations that dwell upon the face of the earth)—we rejoice, I say, that our colored brethren, in our own colonies, emancipated on the 1st day of August, 1838, have made such a use of their liberty, such progressive advancement, notwithstanding all the difficulties that could not fail to press on them, and prevent, to a considerable extent, the realization of their wishes—that notwithstanding of these, there has been such a complete dissipation of all the alarms of the pro-slavery classes, and that it has been proved beyond question that the blacks are men—that they are capable of great mental improvement, able to manage their own affairs, and capable of receiving the high-toned lessons of Christianity, and receiving them not into their understandings alone, but into their hearts, and able also to provide and maintain for themselves the ordinances of the Gospel—rejoicing, as I know they do, in sitting under their vine and fig-tree, no man daring to make them afraid. (Cheers.) I rise, Sir, to move the adoption of this Report; and in doing so, I beg it to be distinctly understood that there are some parts of it with which I do not accord. I accord with your great principles; but there are certain points in that report on which it will be necessary for me, from the peculiar position I hold as one of the deputation to America, to notice, and enter my dissent from them. (Cries of "Hear, hear.") Allusion has been made to our not thinking it our duty to ask information from the office bearers of your Society. I believe I could not have gone to a better quarter to procure information, and perhaps I needed it; for I must tell you that I went to America under a very different impression in regard to the Churches of America, from that which I brought home with me. I was not prepared to find that the Churches of America were so linked with Slavery as they are. (Hear.) I had heard it asserted, and I had seen things that grieved me to the heart, but I must candidly say, that neither my excellent friend, Dr. Cunninghame, nor myself were prepared to meet with such a close linking with Slavery as we found exemplified in some of the American churches. (Hear.) I must let you know, however, that your condemnation of the American churches is sometimes too sweeping, and therefore a caveat to this effect must be put in. I must make honorable mention of four distinct Presbyterian churches, who act on the principle of having no fellowship with those who hold human property. Though these churches are not numerically the largest, though they are comparatively small, yet they deserve honorable mention in this respect, they are standing boldly forward and suffering loss on account of their adherence to the principles which you profess. (Cheers.) The first I shall name is the Reformed Presbyterian Church of the United States, consisting of two distinct branches, nearly, if not entirely, at one on this question. The second is the Associate Synod, comprising a very respectable, though not very numerous class; and from many of whom, when in the South, we received great kindness and most liberal contributions, not one particle of the money being tainted by Slavery. The third is the General Associate body, answering to what used to be called the Old Light. The fourth is the Associate Reformed, comprising a portion of the Associated Burghers and the Reformed Synod, a body who have suffered also for their principles (Cheers.) I think it proper to notice these things, as they deserve encouragement at our hands. They would be our best assistants in matters connected with the American churches. And then I must speak a word for my friends of the Methodist persuasion, from the Bishops connected with which we received the greatest possible kindness. (Renewed cheers.) Mr. Lewis and I were called to address the Conference, and to preach before it. Though of course we were not entitled to enter on the question of Slavery there, we made no secret of our views in our communings with them in committees, and in our private intercourse with them. The body of Christians have passed, by a respectable majority, an important resolution, binding themselves to great principles, decidedly Anti-Slavery; and I believe a division, or, as we are accustomed to call it in Scotland, in the Free Church annals, a disruption is likely to take place in the body. (Cheers.) But here I must answer the question, how did you think of going among them at all? Now, in point of fact, it was to Dr. Cunninghame and myself matter of serious consideration whether we should receive invitations coming from many quarters, as, for example, from ministers and congregations, many of whom had nothing to do with Slavery at all. (Cheers.) We did feel the delicacy of our position. We viewed the question much in the same light in which the great question of the Slave-Trade itself was considered for many years, during the time of Wilberforce, when it became a question of casuistry, whether it was consistent with Christian principle to make use of sugar grown by slave labor. We knew that that question had divided the Christian world; and for a long period the city of Glasgow was so deeply implicated in the question of the Slave-Trade, that it was difficult for ministers, and elders, and others to know what was their line of duty. We knew that men like Newton, having interest in the Slave-Trade, did continue in it during the very time that writings were everywhere circulated against the system. We looked upon it as a question of casuistry how far we were entitled to analyse the sources from which contributions came, or the private motives that dictated them. It is a mistake to suppose that you are entirely free from pro-slavery money by keeping away from the Slave States. It is a mistake to suppose that you can visit the Free States without coming in contact with money tinged with blood. In fact, American Slavery is ramified from Maine to the Gulf of Mexico. The money vested in the slave system is very great. The clothing for the negroes is furnished by the Northern States; there is so much in the way of money and family connections, and so much in the way of ecclesiastical connection, that the ramifications of Slavery extend with more or less power, from one end of the Republic to the other. (Hear.)

Where was it that Miss Crandall was arrested and committed to prison for allowing free-colored children to attend her school? It was not in the South, it was in none of the States made foul with Slavery, but it was in Connecticut, a free State. (Hear.) One of the things that struck me most forcibly was, that the prejudice is almost universal against color, and in favor of something like a modified slavery. Nothing struck me more than the pertinacity with which gentlemen in the Northern States contended for the abstract principle of Slavery, which they did as strongly as gentlemen in the South. Indeed, I look upon the cause of Slavery as entrenched in the American republic. I do not see, humanly speaking, any prospect of a change till you bring that republic to see that it is her interest, in a pecuniary view, to substitute free for slave labor; and till Britain read her a lesson, by showing that, through our commerce with other parts of the world, we can get our cotton without her. (Cheers.) Moral means must be used—the gospel must be used—the churches of Christ, and all who love God and man, must strain every nerve to get the system destroyed; but I deliberately tell you, that if you want to get one argument more than another to tell on the American mind, from Maine to Mexico, that is the argument derived from the market for their cotton; and if Britain can show that she can act on America in that way—if the gold which Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire, not to speak of Lancashire, gives now to American Slavery, be given to support a better cause, then America will begin to look

particularly struck in his late visit to America. The argument in favor of Slavery, most plausible in the estimation of the Americans, was, "We cannot help ourselves, we cannot interfere with the State legislatures of the different provinces." Now, my answer to this was, that as men and Christians, they had to do with all matters connected with morality, religion, and the rights of man: that while each State is independent, there are certain duties that belong to the Congress, and one of the first of these is to abolish slavery in its own District of Columbia. (Cheers.) In Congress there is the North countryman, and the West free-States man, and the South countryman: why did they not all agree to put down Slavery where they have the power? Here, in this District of Columbia, under the very eye and nose of the collective wisdom and might of America, slaves are kept shut up in a gloomy-looking place. Why does not Congress set them free, when it can do so without interfering with the independent legislatures of individual States? (Cheers.) Then, the question was often put, "What have *you* to do with it?" I found the sensitiveness of the Americans as to British interference excessive, so much so, that I could not have conceived it possible. The idea of Britain interfering with their institutions, was constantly thrown in my way, and this was declared to be an objection that was invulnerable. I asked one learned clergyman this: Has your church given any testimony against Slavery recently? He said, no, sir, Slavery, is one of the civil institutions of the country, with which the Church has nothing to do. (Hear.) I replied, that I took a different view of it—that if there was anything in the institutions of the country adverse to morality and religion, and the rights of man, they were bound to lift up a testimony against it. There was in America a strong impression that there was nothing in the Scriptures that positively condemned Slavery. They fell into the error that it was necessary to find in the Bible a text, word for word, condemning a thing before they were entitled to condemn it, forgetting that the Bible was a book which laid down great principles, and that from these, and from the whole genius of Christianity, Slavery was proved to be an evil. After giving some further specimens of the arguments used in favor of Slavery, the Rev. doctor made reference to the settlements in Canada for the reception of runaway slaves from the United States. He then spoke of the prejudice against color, which everywhere existed in the States. Never had he experienced more delight than when he met with a congregation of 1000 black men and women, assembled on a week-day evening. At Baltimore, he drank tea with a clergyman just before they went to hear a black man preach. He asked the clergyman, if the black preacher were to come into his house just now, would he allow him to sit down with them? He was an ordained minister—they preached in the same church—occasionally attended prayer meetings together, and were in the habit of associating together for religious purposes—would he, considering all these circumstances, allow the black preacher to sit down to tea with them if he came in. His answer was, "I would, but my family would not, they would leave me." (Hear, and cries of "Shame.") There were 20,000 free blacks in Baltimore, and 6,000 of them connected with the Church, and he found them, in morality, delicacy, and sense of propriety, and in their manners, altogether a very superior class. (Cheers.) He differed from the report as to the progress of the abolition cause in America. He did not think the cause was progressing so much as the report seemed to indicate. He thought the prejudice on the question was increasing. When the Rev. Theodore Wright came over to this country, though he paid for a cabin passage, he was not allowed to be there, but was put into the steerage. In returning, Mr. Wright went in a British ship, and a proposal was made that he should again be ejected from the cabin, but the British captain said no; he has paid his fare in the cabin, and has a right to be there. (Cheers.) But he was grieved to say that there was some ground to believe British captains were beginning to act as the American captains did. He got a hint of this in America, and his friend, the Rev. George Lewis, had confirmed it. When Mr. Lewis, came home, there was a respectable black man in the steamer, whom the captain excluded from the cabin. (Shame.) He mentioned this on the authority of Mr. Lewis, and would rejoice if it turned out unfounded. This was a thing which they must check; and he was sure that those who had Scottish capital invested in these steamers would be ashamed of such a thing, and that, when known, instructions will be given to maintain the honor of the British character. (Cheers.) [Here there were cries of "Name."] He could not at that moment name the steamer. It was the one Mr. Lewis came home in, and it could easily be ascertained. He repeated that he did not think the cause was making much progress in America. He believed that if the Free Church deputation were called upon to go over to America again, they would find it their duty to assume a much higher position in regard to the matter—(cheers)—and he thought the information they had given would tell forcibly on the Free Church. He did not think they would give back the money. They did not know to whom to give it back. The Rev. doctor then went on to give some reasons for stating that the abolition cause was not making much progress; but, on the other hand, stated the cheering fact that 60,000 abolition votes had been obtained for Mr. Birney, the abolition candidate, for the Presidential Chair—(cheers)—the emancipation of forty slaves by Cassius Clay, &c. &c. The Rev. doctor concluded by moving the adoption of the report.

From the Public Ledger.

THE SLAVE-TRADE.

The Slave-Trade is the Judas-Iscariotism of the nineteenth century. It is the great act of the betrayer and murderer of man. Homicide, which claims a whole continent for its victims, and time without limit for its acts, that forever sneaks behind the shield of State, and the barriers of Custom, is the desolating genius of the Slave-Trade. A war without glory, without provocation, without any of the old lying excuses, or inducements for havoc; a war upon helpless barbarism, upon unoffending simplicity, upon what is distant and isolated, and void in its very constitution of menace or offence to civilization; a war upon penury, whose rags are not even earned; a war upon wretched women, and their more wretched children; a war of strength against weakness, of knowledge against ignorance; a war upon the face and heart and existence of human nature—is the war of the slave-trader. It raises, carried to four continents, instead of one, the issue of man's existence or his extermination. The ratio of the mortality which arises from the Slave-Trade, universally extended, would, in a few months, wither up and sweep off every human being from the face of the globe. Had Europe, Asia, and America, their slave conquerers and killers, with powers of mischief dictated by blind avarice, as has Africa, the world would at once become postadamite as regards the race. Man would cease to be. Murder, disease, and famine, would utterly destroy him.

The first efforts to suppress the slave-trade were made in this country. European States have generally followed the example. At the Congress of Vienna, its abolition was agreed upon, immediately by some, prospectively by other powers. A spirit worthy of camp-followers and body-strippers was manifested on the occasion by the first gentlemen of Europe. The Abbé du Pradt, in his History of this Congress, tells us secrets worth knowing, that should forever silence the tongue of foreign defamation when it wags against America in regard to Slavery. Carrying the war into Africa—stealing men, women, and children, and killing two-thirds of any given number for the sake of the other third, was considered an Interest by the members of that Congress. An Interest not to be disputed Robbery and murder constituted a vested right. Butchery, without the old rubbish of a war declaration, was treated as a settled principle like that of corn and cotton. So many men, so many ships, so much money were involved in the said trade of butchery, that it became a great national interest, which required time to modify, or was beyond modification.

The two Governments which now take the lead in the infamy of the Slave-Trade, are Spain and Brazil. Portugal plays the beggarly part of allowing the exportation of slaves, but does not so fully wrap herself up in the mantle of shame as the two others. There is a set of men in Spain and Brazil who maintain this traffic. They are openly countenanced by the Governments, and officials connive at the trade, and derive profit from the crime.

The number of slaves annually taken from Africa, is estimated variously from one hundred, to one hundred and fifty thousand. Sir F. Buxton takes the latter calculation. Vandervelt assumes it to be one hundred and twenty thousand. It is fairly calculated that for every slave captured and landed in a foreign country, two others are destroyed. This fearful havoc arises from the mode of their capture, and the manner they are treated in the slave-ship. When the time of year comes round for sending a slave caravan to the coast, it is usual to secure victims in this manner:—A peaceful village is fired in the dead of night by armed men. The inhabitants rushing from the flames are captured; or, if they resist, they are massacred. Then comes the selection of slaves. Children old enough to march with the caravan, and the healthy of either sex are selected for slaves. The aged and infirm, and the young, including infants at the mother's breast, are murdered on the spot. Those who are strong enough to be feared, are yoked or manacled, and then commences the march, under the lash. Those who falter and fall are left, prey for the wild beasts. The routes of slave caravans may be traced by the bones of thousands who have thus perished. On the arrival of the slaves at the coast, they are packed together, and die off fast. The captain of the slaver makes his selection. Those whom he rejects are killed or left to perish. The slaver always carries a fourth or a third more than it can fairly hold. This is done by a strict arithmetical calculation, for the cargo to be landed must include a certain number of slaves, and allowance is to be made for deaths. The loss by these is ingeniously anticipated and overcome by packing the ship with more than it can carry properly. Slaves that are sick, or promise to be good for nothing, are thrown overboard. There is no variation to the intense blackness to the details of the transaction from first to last. It is sneaking, perfidious, blood-stained cruelty throughout.

As long as Spain and Brazil allow the daily bread of their Executive power to be its daily shame, and uphold the traffic, so long will the Slave-Trade prosper. That it is necessary for those Governments to interfere to suppress the trade, is evident. In 1840 and 1841, the Brazilian authorities interfered for its suppression, and the good effect was evident. During those years the Brazilian authorities did interfere; they can do so again, and more effectually. Espartero, much to his credit, when in power, appointed an honorable and enlightened man, General Valdez, to the command of Cuba. He disdained to soil his hands with the money which his predecessors used to derive from the Slave-Trade. He assembled the land-holders and merchants of Cuba and informed them, that acting under orders from his government, and according to his own sense of duty, he had determined to suppress the Slave-Trade in Cuba. He was almost fully true to his word; the second year, 1842, he reduced the number of imported slaves to 3,100—it was 14,000 when he came into power.

Both Spain and Brazil have relapsed from their worthy and respectable attempts to subdue the evil. Their present shame is the more enormous from such declension in the scale of morals. No excuse, no subterfuge, no lie can save the officers of their Government from the blood-money curses which each day now fall on their heads.

From the Baltimore Saturday Visiter.

CHARLES T. TORREY.—A CARD.

An attempt to escape from the Baltimore jail, on the part of Chas. T. Torrey, imprisoned on a charge of aiding the escape of slaves, both from Maryland and Virginia, having been discovered and frustrated, the city press of Saturday morning comments upon the circumstances in a manner calculated to increase the popular prejudice, always intense in the slaveholding States, against any person laboring under a similar charge. Attention is especially directed in the papers to the seeming incongruity of this attempt, with his previous public assertion, not only of a readiness, but of an anxious desire to meet the important legal issues involved in his case. I feel bound to state, in justice to Mr. T. and without having consulted him, and in order that his recent attempt may have no other prejudicial effect upon the public mind than that which would naturally result, that this apparent inconsistency does not in fact exist.

The legal issues specified by Mr. T. in his late address to the public, can only be tried in the courts of the United States, first in the Circuit, and then in the Supreme Court. In order to get a hearing upon these points before those courts, it became necessary as a preliminary step, to give bail in the city court in the sum of $2,000.

We have endeavored for several weeks assiduously, to obtain bail, making every exertion in our power to that effect, but without success. Although the bail would not have discharged Mr. T. for a moment from custody, and might have been released in a week, in case of an unfavorable decision in the Circuit Court, (the only object of it being to procure him a hearing before that court,) we were unable to obtain it—not, as we became entirely satisfied, from apprehension of risk on the part of those to whom we applied, but solely on account of the odium attached to the unpopular nature of the charge. Had it been manslaughter, arson, or rape, the difficulty might have been obviated.

Under these circumstances, I informed Mr. Torrey several days ago, of the utter hopelessness of obtaining bail, and consequently, of getting the important points, which both himself and numerous friends at the North were sincerely and ardently desirous to have tried and adjudicated, before the highest tribunals of the country. Mr T. did not, therefore, I am persuaded, desire to escape from prison to avoid a thorough investigation of the questions of law involved in his case while *that* seemed attainable, but was, on the contrary, I am inclined to believe, *driven* to his unfortunate attempt by despair of being able to procure such investigation.

For one, I do not find in my heart to reprehend very sternly the unwillingness of any man, *especially a Northern Abolitionist*, to meet a jury in a slaveholding State, upon a question touching in any way the interests of Slavery.

Interest and passion and popular clamor *may* influence even the purest of men. Mere surmises may, in the willing or the incautious mind, ripen into proofs. A penitentiary is, at best, an uncomfortable home, and even the tedium and annoyances of confinement in the city jail, with declining health, have been, I think, but little alleviated, with a few worthy exceptions, by "*the active agency*," "*the honorable sympathy*," or the solicitations and friendly inquiries of the citizens of Baltimore, though these are often bestowed upon the most degraded felon.

Thus much, I have felt it my duty, as the counsel of Mr. Torrey, to say, fearing that an undue use might be made, by those anxious to convict him, of an occurrence which is neither novel or surprising, under circumstances such as these I have indicated, and which has no intrinsic connection with the questions of the truth or falsity of the charges against my client, or the guilt or innocence of the acts charged.

S. P. ANDREWS,
of counsel for C. T. Torrey.

We should not feel that we had performed our duty to this community, did we let the above disparaging statements go forth without a word of comment. We do not believe Mr. Andrews capable of a willful misrepresentation of public sentiment here; but upon a calm review of his declarations, we must say that we are inclined to think he has misconceived the state of feeling in Baltimore, with respect to the object of Slavery. Had he confined his declaration to a belief that justice could not be obtained at the hands of a Baltimore jury, to the case of Mr. Torrey, we might not be disposed to complain, because the course of Torrey, in sending forth the address which appeared recently in the Saturday Visiter, may have so embarrassed his case as to interfere more or less with a due awardment of justice—calculated, as it unquestionably was, to make personal enemies of the most relentless kind—but we are not willing to allow that justice cannot be obtained in this city "on questions in any way involving the interests of Slavery."

We fear Mr. Andrews has been misled on this subject by the silly bluster of that portion of the daily press, which is ever ready to sail timidly upon the current of the hour, and to pander to the public feeling that may happen to prevail at the moment, fearing that a nobler course might lose them a little "patronage." Now, we tell him that, whatever may be the sentiment here with respect to his client's conduct, supposing him to have committed the acts charged upon him (and a fear of embarrassing his case, still forbids our giving our own opinions) and whatever degree of punishment might be supposed requisite in case of conviction—however these questions may stand, we do not hesitate to say that the great mass of the people of Baltimore city, from whose ranks a jury must come, have no love whatever for Slavery. The population of the State at large have no love for it. They have not been wholly blind to its blasting influence upon the soil of Maryland—not to name other obvious facts. We declare what we know, as one but recently a slaveholder in Maryland, as we had been hereditarily, in our native Virginia. There is a sentiment on this subject, which is growing daily, and will ere long command respect, and demand a hearing in a form wholly constitutional in a national as well as Marylandic sense. Let our Maryland readers mark what we now say in that spirit of frankness which they have ever been wont to expect from us, and which they have so long rewarded with their approval, however some of them may differ with us in sentiment upon many topics coming up for discussion.

We have felt bound to give expression to the above views, fearing to let Mr. Andrews's inference, however sincerely drawn, go forth uncontested, to be used among Northern Abolitionists as an indisputable fact. Thank God, justice has not taken her everlasting flight from Baltimore, whatever may be the impressions to the contrary, which the people of the North may entertain—and, if we may take the card of Mr. A. as a true index to their opinions, they must indeed think us wofully degenerate!

Communications.

NON-VOTING THEORY.

REPLY TO MESSRS. WHITE, EARLE, AND BOWDITCH.

MY DEAR GAY:—Five years ago I adopted the no-voting position, and reluctantly as this was done, and much as I have often since desired to vote, I have yet seen no argument which would justify me in quitting it. The ingenuity of my friends may prove, satisfactorily to them, how inconsistent I am, may perhaps ask me questions which time only can answer, but they never will convince me that it is my duty to return fugitive slaves, or to swear that I will do so, for the express purpose of breaking my promise.

I am aware that we non-voters are rather singular. But history, from the earliest Christians downwards, is full of instances of men who refused all connection with Government, and all the influence which office could bestow, rather than deny their principles, or aid in doing wrong. Yet I never heard them called either idiots or over-scrupulous. Sir Thomas More need never have mounted the scaffold, had he only consented to take the oath of supremacy. He had only to tell a lie with solemnity, as we are asked to do, and he might not only have saved his life, but, as the trimmers of his day would have told him, doubled his influence. Pitt resigned his place as Prime Minister of England, rather than break faith with the Catholics of Ireland. Should I not resign a petty ballot rather than break faith with the slave? But I was specially glad to find a distinct recognition of the principle upon which we have acted, applied to a different point, in the life of that Patriarch of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, Granville Sharpe. It is in the last number of the Edinburgh Review. While an underclerk in the War Office, he sympathized with our fathers in their struggle for Independence, "Orders reached his office to ship munitions of war to the revolted colonies. If his hand had entered the account of such a cargo, it would have contracted in his eyes the stain of innocent blood. To avoid that pollution, he resigned his place and his means of subsistence at a period of life when he could no longer hope to find any other lucrative employment." As the thoughtful clerk of the War Office takes his hat down from the peg where it has used to hang for twenty years, methinks I hear Mr. Earle cry out, "Friend Sharpe, you are absurdly scrupulous." "You may innocently aid Government in doing wrong," adds Bowditch. While Liberty Party yelps at his heels, "My dear Sir, you are quite losing your influence!" And indeed it is melancholy to reflect how, from that moment the mighty underclerk of the War Office (!) dwindled into the mere Granville Sharpe of history! the man of whom Mansfield and Hargrave were content to learn law, and Wilberforce, philanthropy.

William A. White proposes to vote for men who shall be pledged not to take office unless the oath to the Constitution is dispensed with, and who shall then go on to perform in their offices only such duties as we, their constituents, approve. He cites, in support of his view, the election of O'Connell to the House of Commons, in 1828, I believe, just one year before the "Oath of Supremacy," which was the objectionable one to the Catholics, was dispensed with. Now, if we stood in the same circumstances as the Catholics did in 1828, the example would be in point. When the public mind is thoroughly revolutionized, and ready for the change, when the billow has reached its heighth and begins to crest into foam, then such a measure may bring matters to a crisis. But let us first go through, in patience, as O'Connell did, our twenty years of agitation. Waiving all other objections, White's plan seems to me mere playing at politics, and an entire waste of effort. It loses our high position as moral reformers; it subjects us to all that malignant opposition and suspicion of motives which attend the array of parties; and while thus closing up our access to the national conscience, it wastes in fruitless caucussing and party tactics, the time and the effort which should have been directed to efficient agitation.

With my friend Earle, I have no further argument. If I understand his philosophy, it is, that a man's idea of expediency is his sole and highest rule of right,—that the end justifies the means. At least he considers the returning of fugitive slaves, and the promise to return them as acts which are right or wrong according to circumstances. His first letter was based on the supposition that our Constitution requires such return and such promise, since it was addressed to, and intended for those who so believe, and his second letter in *allusion to this very point*, holds "that what was wrong to be done under certain circumstances, would become right to be done under other circumstances,"—and again, referring to *the same point*, that, participating in Government, we may innocently "do that which we should think it sin to do, if we had the absolute control of affairs, but which is no sin as circumstances exist." These sentences must refer to the pro-slavery clauses of the Constitution, or the whole reasoning is irrelevant.

Now, though I agree that in regard to actions indifferent in themselves, circumstances determine our duty; I hold also, that some actions are wrong in themselves, and such, no circumstances can justify. Slaveholding is one of these. Returning fugitive slaves is another. It seems to me, that according to his views, Mr. Earle might consistently become a slaveholder, if, under "existing circumstances," he thought it expedient, and an increase of his influence. On the Anti-Slavery platform I have no fault to find with Mr. Earle. He acts consistently with his creed in supporting the Constitution. The only point remaining between us is a question of fact, whether on the whole the Union does more good than harm. Upon this discussion, I have no wish to enter at present.

With regard to the inconsistencies of which Mr. Earle supposes me guilty in the payment of taxes, &c. those who will take the trouble to read my first letter will see, I think, that he has not touched one of my points: those who will not take that trouble would as little value anything more I could urge.

My friend thinks that few Abolitionists would approve of my reforming Government "by force." If he will look back at my language, he will find I did not propose to employ force. He had asked me how my views were consistent with any form of Government, and I proceeded to show him how in perfect conformity with "*the theory of republican institutions*" my plan of reform would work itself out,—in conformity with the views of Government held by Locke, Sidney, and the men of '76. I never said I approved of that theory. My only object was to show that taking Governments as the standard writers model them, my views were tenable. My present conviction is, that no Christian is authorized to employ force in the reform of any mere political institutions.

The difficulties thought to lie in the way of finding where and when a majority exists, move me very little. Should the case ever occur, there will be no practical difficulty. But if there were, it is no matter of mine. God, the great conservative power of the Universe, when he established the right, saw to it that it should always be the safest and best. He never laid upon a poor finite worm the staggering load of following out into infinity the complex results of his actions. We may rest on the bosom of infinite wisdom, confident that it is enough for us to do justice, he will see to it that happiness results.

The last sentence of Mr. Earle's second letter, I do not fully understand. If he can show that there are no pro-slavery clauses in the Constitution—or that, there being such, the man who swears to support them does not "assume" any pro-slavery "obligation," I shall cheerfully receive the light, and will endeavor to profit by it, and vote as often as he wishes.

I agree with Dr. Bowditch in feeling "myself bound by my duty to God, and to the slave, to use moral suasion first, and political action afterwards." But as I would not, at Rome, kiss the Pope's slipper, and pretend to be a Catholic in order to gain influence, and exert a wider "moral suasion;" so neither will I pretend to love Slavery at the ballot-box, to increase my "political influence." When Dr. Bowditch will show me how I can approach that ballot-box without impliedly swearing to return fugitive slaves, I will gladly join him in its use. The man who makes such a promise and means to keep it, is a knave,—he who makes and intends to break it, is a liar.

I fully appreciate the earnest and conscientious sincerity with which Mr. W. I. Bowditch urges his views, and hope time will bring us nearer together. He thinks that, as men and all their works are imperfect, we may innocently "support a Government which, along with many blessings, assists in the perpetration of some wrong." Now, as nobody disputes that we may rightly assist the worst Government in doing good, provided we can do so without at the same time aiding it in the wrong it perpetrates, he must mean, of course, that it is right to aid and obey a Government *in doing wrong*, if we think that, on the whole, the Government effects more good than harm. Otherwise his whole argument is irrelevant, for this is the point in dispute; since every office of any consequence under the United States Constitution has some immediate connection with Slavery. Does my friend see to what lengths this principle will carry him? Herod's servants then were right in slaying every child in Bethlehem, from two years old and under, "provided they thought Herod's Government, on the whole, more a blessing than a curse to Judea!" The soldiers of Charles II. were justified in shooting the Covenanters on the muirs of Scotland, if they thought his rule was better, on the whole, for England, than anarchy! According to this theory, the moment the magic wand of Government touches our vices, they start up into virtues! But has Government any peculiar character or privilege in this respect? Oh, no—Government is only an association of individuals, and the same rules of morality which govern my conduct in relation to a thousand men, ought to regulate my conduct to any one. Therefore, I may innocently aid a man in doing wrong, if I think that, on the whole, he has more virtues than vices. If he gives bread to the hungry six days in the week, I may rightly help him, on the seventh, in forging bank notes, or murdering his father! The principle goes this length, and every length, or it cannot be proved to exist at all. It ends at last, practically, in the old maxim, that the subject and the soldier have no right to keep any conscience, but have only to obey the rulers they serve: for there are few, if any, Governments this side of Satan's, which could not, in some sense, be said to do more good than harm. Now I candidly confess to my friend, that I had rather be covered over with inconsistencies, in the struggle to keep my hands clean, than settle quietly down on such a principle as his. It is supposing that we may—

"To do a great right, do a little wrong;"

a rule, which the master poet of human nature has rebuked. It is doing evil that good may come—a doctrine, of which an Apostle has pronounced the condemnation.

My friend wishes to know how, with my principles, I can innocently patronize or support a paper, or circulate a book, which advocates anything I do not approve, or think bad. He thinks I ought to consider this as aiding another in doing wrong. At the risk of being tedious, I will tell him. First, premising that I do not consider the mere purchase of a book or paper to be, in any true sense, supporting or patronizing it, (as for instance paying the Liberator $2.50 per year, which I advise everybody to do.) If I buy of a man a bushel of wheat, I am not responsible if afterward he makes a bad use of the money. Trade is the exchange of equivalents. I do not give a man anything by merely taking something he has, and replacing it with another thing of equal value. By purchasing a musket to shoot bears, I do not become guilty of the murder which my neighbor commits with a musket afterwards bought at the same store. I may thus be the *occasion* of evil, but am not responsible for it. Many innocent acts *occasion* evil, and in such case all I am bound to ask myself before doing such *innocent act*, is, "Shall I occasion, on the whole, more harm or good." There are many cases where doing a duty even, we shall occasion evil and sin in others. To save a slaveholder from drowning, when we know he has made a will freeing his slaves, would put off, perhaps forever, their emancipation, but of course that is not my fault. Further, I may buy an infidel book, to answer it—or a whole edition of them, to burn; either act might, according to circumstances, be right. I am no more responsible for the use the author makes of the money, than I should be had I bought of him so much beef, and he had applied the profits to circulate Tom Paine's works. The money is fairly his. By services rendered me he has earned it. To his own master he standeth or falleth. All I have to see to is, that I do not buy the book, but for a good purpose, and one which is worth the money I give for it. Do not say that by simply taking a paper, I countenance *all* it says. No one does, or has a right, to consider me as doing that.

Patronage and support I call, sending an author or editor an additional sum for the express purpose of aiding him to continue his labors, for which we ask no equivalent ourselves, except in the general effect of those labors.

But whether my friend accepts this distinction or not, I will try to tell him why, in any sense, I support an imperfect man in his labors, who will of course differ from me on many points and advocate them. For this reason. Free discussion in the hands of honest men, at a proper time and place, is always a good, and nothing but a good. If bad men pervert it, that is their fault, not ours. Considering the marriage institution sacred, and the very corner stone of society, I could yet cheerfully aid truth-loving men, at proper times, in discussing its rules and sanctions, &c. This is not only my right, but my duty. Does not experience tell me, that no matter how fully I believed a thing ten years ago, intercourse with men who differed from me, has changed my views and made me wiser. Is it not duty to continue the practice? But if I may innocently seek the society of those who differ from me, may I not buy their conversation when printed? And that which I find good for me, may I not extend to others. If, as Mr. Bowditch says, he thinks that the Liberator in merely discussing the disunion question, does harm, he is wrong, in my opinion, to support it, in any true sense of that word. There are some publications which are not fair discussions, and such, no fancied good can justify us in supporting. Would I patronize a book which, to ninety pages of moral principles, adds ten pages of indecent prints? It seems to me I should sin in so doing. Yet my friends theory would tell me, "Do it, else along with one grain of error, you stifle two grains of truth?"

Mr. Bowditch thinks that if, not being non-resistants, we concede to mankind the right to frame Governments, which must, from the very nature of man, be more or less evil, the right or duty to support them, when framed, necessarily follows. With all deference, I do not think it follows at all. Mankind, that is, any number of them, have a right to set up such forms of worship as they see fit, but when they have done so, does it necessarily follow that I am in duty bound to support any one of them, whether I approve it or not? Government is precisely like any other voluntary association of individuals—a temperance or anti-slavery society, a bank or railroad corporation. I join it, or not, as duty dictates. If a temperance society exists in the village where I am, that love for my race which bids me seek its highest good, commands me to join it. So if a Government is formed in the land where I live, the same feeling bids me to support it, if I innocently can. This is the whole length of my duty to Government. From the necessity of the case, and that constitution of things which God has ordained, it follows that in any specified district, the majority must rule—hence results the duty of the minority to submit. But we must carefully preserve the distinction between *submission* and *obedience*—between *submission* and *support*. If the majority set up an immoral Government, I obey those laws which seem to me good, because they are good—not because Government commands them, and I submit to all the penalties which my disobedience of the rest brings on me. This is alike the dictate of common sense, and the command of Christianity. And it must be the true doctrine, since any other obliges me to obey the majority if they command me to commit murder, a rule which even the tory Blackstone has denied. For me to do anything I deem wrong, is the same, in quality, as to commit murder.

My friend thinks our spirit "pharisaical." "Shall we, 'weak, sinful men,' he says, "perhaps even more sinful than the slaveholder, cry out, No Union with Slaveholders." Such a course is, in his opinion, wanting in brotherly kindness. Were I not fully persuaded of the entire sincerity of my friend, I should pass this suggestion unnoticed. But surely he mistakes our position entirely. Because we refuse to aid a wrong-doer in his sin, we by no means proclaim, or assume, that we think our *whole character* better than his. It is neither pharisaical to have opinions, nor presumptuous to guide our lives by them. If I have joined with others in doing wrong, is it either presumptuous or unkind, when my eyes are opened, to refuse to go any further with them in their career of guilt? Does love to the thief require me to help him in stealing? Yet this is all we refuse to do. We will extend to the slaveholder all the courtesy he will allow. If he is hungry, we will feed him; if he is in want, both hands shall be stretched out for his aid. We will give him full credit for all the good that he does, and our deep sympathy in all the temptations under whose strength he falls. But to help him in his sin, to remain partners with him in the slave trade, is more than he has a right to ask. He would be a strange preacher who should set out to reform his circle by joining in all their sins! It is a principle similar to that which the tipsy Duke of Norfolk acted on, when seeing a drunken friend in the gutter, he cried out, "My dear fellow, I can't help you out, but I'll do better, I'll lie down by your side."

Next follows his criticisms on the inconsistencies of non-voters, in petitioning, sueing, holding stocks, and paying taxes. This is what logicians calls a *reductio ad absurdum*: an attempt to prove our principle unsound by showing that, fairly carried out, it leads to an absurdity. Now, I assert that, granting all Mr. Bowditch asks, he has not saddled us with any absurdity at all. It is perfectly possible to live without petitioning, sueing, or holding stocks. Thousands in this country have lived, died, and been buried, without doing either. And does it load us with any absurdity to prove that we shall be obliged to do from principle, what the majority of our fellow-citizens do from choice? We lawyers may think it is an absurdity to say a man can't sue, for, like the Apostle at Ephesus, it touches our "craft," but that don't go far to prove it. Then, as to taxes, doubtless many cases might be imagined, when even my friend would allow it would be our duty to resist the slightest taxation, did Christianity allow it, with "war to the hilt." If such cases may ever arise, why may not this be one? But I refer to my former letter, where I think I have shown that we can consistently do all these things.

My friend thinks that my distinction in relation to suits, that one may acknowledge the *power* of a ruler without at the same time acknowledging the *rightfulness* of that power, is unsound, and he challenges me to produce legal authority to the point. Did he never hear why an English subject may swear allegiance to an usurper and yet not be guilty of treason to the true king? Because he may innocently acknowledge the king *de facto* (the king *in deed*,) without assuming him to be king *de jure* (king *by right*). I do not say that I approve of the length to which they carried it, but the distinction itself is as old as the time of Edward the First. If my friend, fresh from the books, is not familiar with it, I commend him to a reperusal of his Blackstone. The principle is equally applicable to suits. It has been universally acted on and allowed. The Catholic, who shrank from acknowledging the heretical Government of England, always, I believe, sued in her courts.

As I view it at present, I could not hold Government stock, but I see no difficulty as to bank—and other stocks. What are they? A hundred men put their funds together to trade or use. Government steps in and forbids it unless they accept its permission. In doing so, they do not acknowledge its right to exact such submission. The Gospel bids us yield up a coat, if it be taken from us. Does that allow the robber's right? Suppose, then, in some calm hour, we ask it of him again, and with his permission receive it, does that act acknowledge that he had the right to retain it? The cases are parallel.

Mr. Bowditch bids me leave the country. Why? Because, he says, "Society has the right to prescribe the terms, upon the expressed or implied agreement to comply with which a person may reside within its limits." This principle I utterly deny. Where did he find it? All that Society has a right to demand is peaceful submission to its exactions:—*consent* they have neither the power nor the right to exact or to imply. Twenty men live on a lone island. Nineteen set up a government and say, every man who lives there shall worship idols. The twentieth submits to all their laws, but refuses to commit idolatry. Have they the *right* to say, "Do so, or quit;" or, to say, "If you stay, we will consider you as impliedly worshipping idols?" Doubtless they have the *power*, but the majority have no *rights*, except those which justice sanctions. Will my friend show me the justice of his principle? I was born here. I ask no man's permission to remain. All that any man or body of men have a right to infer from my staying here, is that, in doing this *innocent act*, I think, that on the whole, I am effecting more good than harm. My friend says I cannot find this right laid down in the books. That will not trouble me. Some old play has a character in it who never ties his neckcloth without a warrant from Mr. Justice Overdo. I claim no relationship to that very scrupulous individual.

I was glad to see that Mr. Bowditch nowhere touches that chord, so much harped upon by our opponents, that we are losing our influence, and becoming less useful. Some may honestly fear such a result. But with most, I suspect arrant selfishness will be seen peeping out from under this scanty covering of a pretended longing to be very useful. It reminds me of the reply of a bed-ridden old lady, ninety-nine years old, to a minister who asked her what he should pray for. "Ask," said she, "that I may be spared while I am useful!"

Allow me in conclusion, to request our opposers to keep distinctly in view the precise point in debate. This is not whether Massachusetts can rightfully trade and make treaties with South Carolina, although she knows that such a course will result in strengthening a wrong-doer. Such are most of the cases which they consider parallel to ours, and for permitting which, they charge us with inconsistency. But the question really is, whether Massachusetts can join hands and strength with South Carolina, for the express and avowed purpose of sustaining Slavery. This she does in the Constitution. For he who swears to support an instrument of twelve clauses, swears to support one as well as another,—and though one only be immoral,—still he swears to do an immoral act. Now, my conviction is, "which fire will not burn out of me," that to return fugitive slaves is a sin—to promise so to do, and not do it, is, if possible, baser still; and that any conjunction of circumstances which makes either necessary, is of the Devil, and not of God. Yours, truly,

WENDELL PHILIPS.

NAHANT, September 26, 1844.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER FROM DR. FUSSELL.

* * * I have lately received several letters from the West, giving statements *how* the Pendleton rioters have been dealt with, "*according to law.*" You recollect that of the mob that broke up our meeting, left brother Douglass for dead, and injured brother White and others, one man had been brought to trial, sentenced, put to jail, and pardoned by the Governor, under a threat of a mob of five hundred armed men to tear down the jail and liberate him by force, if he was not reprieved. About twenty others of the gang, men well known, who were seen by a great number of respectable men, beating with clubs and stones, Douglass, White, and others, were indicted at the same time by the Grand Jury. When another term of Court came on, six months after the first, they were brought up for trial!!!) Some loafer rowdies were brought up for witnesses, who testified they saw the persons on the ground, but did not see them *do anything wrong*. Other respectable persons who were in the Court, waiting to be called upon to testify, who could have given ample evidence to convict the whole gang—*were not called*—and the villians were dismissed, for *want of testimony against them!!!* The Prosecuting Attorney was a candidate for re-election, the mob held the power—it was necessary for the prosecutor to keep in favor—and therefore *picked* witnesses were called, who knew nothing of the riot, or if they did, would disregard their oath—and such only were called—all others being purposely avoided—and none of those who would have testified the truth ventured to *volunteer* evidence against the murderous mob—indeed, for any one to have done so, would have been to invite the rifle ball of the assassin to his heart.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

HARSH LANGUAGE.

Many excellent people no doubt believe that the Abolitionists have postponed to a very distant and indefinite period the Emancipation of the slaves. Good anxious souls! they can weep over some tale of individual wrong and cruelty, and long, no doubt very sincerely, that some way would open wherein they might labor with all their strength in a cause which, in itself considered, enlists all their sympathies, and calls into action all their better nature. From their childhood they have shuddered at the very name of *slave*, as a condition involving all of wretchedness and of utter degradation,—the very hopelessness of unmitigated misery,—and they turn pale almost at the thought of the millions of men here in our own land, who live out their allotted share of cursed life, with no hope but for the grave, or clanking their chains in savage desperation, thirsting for the life-blood of their oppressors. They do remember, also, that millions of women there are, to whom the seventh commandment is as if it were not, compelled by the hard necessity of their position, and the inexorable and cruel fate of the education which makes them what they are, and can permit them to be no otherwise, to live in a condition of prostitution which is not beastly, only because in man it is a violation of the highest law of which the brute cannot be guilty. But they know, also, and their hearts bleed to remember it, that these women are mothers, and that they cannot stifle the affections which women are less than brutes when they have lost; and that the young child is torn from the mother's bosom, and that the solace of maternal care, which, were it left them, no power could make them utterly wretched and degraded, is taken away without the thought of pity. They feel most keenly that the slave—as Charles Lamb said of the poor of England—"knows no childhood," and what he could not say of the English mother,—that the slave-mother has no child. All this they know, and feel, and weep for, and, like Cowper, would rather be themselves the slaves, and suffer all, than cause this endless suffering, this wretchedness to which no mitigation comes, this wrong without excuse, this heaviest curse that has ever fallen on the human race.

There are such people, and explain it by what philosophy we will, they shudder also at the very name of Abolitionist, and do believe most sincerely that these misguided people have, in their mistaken zeal, put back the day whose coming they would hasten, and added to the misery of those whom they would save. These anxious, loving, souls are very timid, also; and it is the fault rather of their heads, than of their hearts that they do not understand us better;—it is the utmost stretch of charity to grant their goodness at the expense of their wisdom. They cannot read the plainest signs, which were traced first in feeble lines, but which have been graved deeper and deeper, year by year, on all the Institutions by which they are surrounded. They cannot understand that sometimes it must be that men will cling closer and closer to a darling sin, when they fear that the means of indulging in it are about to be taken from them; nor do they believe it possible, that any can, nor see the inconsistency of those who do, declare that this great mischief is done, not because it is, but because it is not, and because they believe the Abolitionists are gradually, but surely, undermining the system against which their efforts are directed. They would not have stoned Jesus or Paul, but they would have shuddered to have seen the man, possessed of a devil, torn, when the evil spirit was exorcised, and exclaimed at and deprecated such harsh measures for the poor man's sake, though they would have hated the devil, and wept for the sake of the victim. They would like that the devil would go out without the tearing, and if he will not, they impute it to the exerciser, and not to the devil's nature. They would like to abolish Slavery, but then if people will get angry, and especially if their anger should vent itself on the first passive victim, when any certain effort be made, then are they quite sure that that effort is not made in the right way, nor in the right spirit. All, to be sure, who claim to be of this class are not of it, for there is much arrant h

this, even were man only an animal that loved to have his own corn and bacon, and live where he will? And does it not also deserve a hard name when these young people are shipped, or driven in coffles to the banks of the Mississippi, to be themselves there worked up in seven years in making sugar, because slaveholding economy deems this the cheapest way? Were it your and my lot to be thus raised or thus worked up, I fancy we should deem it fit excuse for some very hard, it might be some very profane language. Or were we even as "fat and sleek" as Henry Clay says his human cattle are, if any spark of manliness were left us, I doubt not that we should say some hard things. This Liberty *is* a dear thing. The privilege to have and love father and mother, and wife and child,—the privilege of going where we will, and being what we choose, with no fear of branding-iron, or rifle ball, or whips and chains—the privilege of a home of our own, and of the fruits of our own labor—of not being raised for market, and not worked up into sugar in seven years when fairly raised—the privilege even of starving after our own fashion, if we must starve, or going to the devil our own way, if we needs must go—this right to call ourselves men, and be no man's brute, but to act a manly part, and fulfill the duties and the destiny which God meant each man should when He created him in "His own image,"—it is a thing we might be pardoned for when we demand, even in not the politest manner, of him who has made us his chattels, that he shall leave us henceforth to go our own ways, and live or die as it shall please God to order.

But people do get used even to harsh language, and that which but a few years since was called so in the Abolitionists, is now very fit and becoming in the mouth of a brawling demagogue in a political caucus. As attention has become awakened to the enormities of Slavery, and the truth pressed home to the hearts of the people, those epithets are recognized as just, and have now passed into common use, which men but a little while ago started at aghast. Now the old charge is made, as the same spirit, which prompted the first application of such indignant language against the system itself, makes the same application to that which sustains it. The Church, with its established priesthood, professing to be ordained of God, and holding up the Bible in proof of its sanctity, and hallowed in the believing hearts of the people, with its various organizations, spreading their strong net-work over the whole land, came to the rescue of oppression and cruelty, because it was seen that she was herself the most guilty in this matter. And the State, which had built her house also by unrighteousness, is declared to be a bulwark of Slavery. "My curse," said Wendell Phillips, "be on the Constitution!" and it is held to be grave matter of charge against the Abolitionists nearly two years after, in a dignified and leading Quarterly, that such words have been uttered, and we are warned against the hot bigotry which could prompt so harsh a saying against the idol of the people. Go into any New England village, and you shall find your most strennous opposers, in men who are set up as "Fathers in Israel," to lead the people into all truth, because they know the faithful Abolitionist will aim his blows, not at the Church in itself, but at its position as the defender and bulwark of Slavery. Yet is the time not far distant, when in these things also shall harshness of language, and the most indignant and withering rebuke, be justified by the common use. As a new generation steps forward in the place of those who have preceded them, they shall find that their new faith also needs a new form, and the old shall drop away because it no longer answers to their want in this particular, and the newer and the truer take its place. How long will it be before the late Jesuitical and contemptible course of that "Mother of Abominations," the Methodist Episcopal Church, shall be seen in its true light, and repudiated by all just men; and the praise of it by any Scottish Doctor of Divinity, who may come among us asking money, and taking all he can get, because none is "untainted of blood,"—as if the first thing was the getting of money, and to be got at any rate, let its color be what it may,—shall be held as proving him worthy of a title quite other than a *Divine* one?

Harsh language! I would that I were master of it. I would that I could

"Wreak
My thoughts upon expression, and thus throw"

all that I feel, and have felt, towards those abominations, "into one word," to arouse the people, even the Abolitionists, many of them, as to what it is that stands between them and the slave. In another column of this paper will be found the proceedings of the Synod of Cincinnati, in the case of Wm. Graham, on a charge of heresy. What has this man done to deserve so grave a charge? Defended Slavery from the Bible. Prostituted his learning, his sacerdotal influence, his position as a man, to the defence of a system which sets at defiance all the laws of God, and gives the lie to every effort for humanity, that sage or philosopher has ever made. Heresy, forsooth! The book or the religion that could tolerate such an utter disregard of everything that makes man distinguishable from the brute, and virtually declares there is no God, deserves only to be laughed at by the veriest heathen that the sun shines upon. And Reverend Ministers of the Gospel, and learned Doctors of Divinity could sit three long days, and utter their prosy nothings over a case like this, which the instinct of an untutored savage would have decided in only time enough to have pointed him to a plantation slave, and one of the precepts of the religion which these men profess to believe. Three times did the sun rise and set on a body of men, esteemed to be the best in the land, in that enlightened city, in this nineteenth century after Christ, and gravely did they deliberate whether the defence of the rightfulness of stealing the young child in the cradle, and from that cradle to the grave, through his whole life long, making him the victim of passion and of avarice, could be properly defined as a "doctrine opposed to, or inconsistent with the fundamental truths of the Gospel;" and declared it finally to be too grave a matter for them to decide! And yet this is after all no strange thing when we consider the matter well, for are not every one of these men doing practically, in their church relations, what this "beloved brother" has had the boldness to avow to be right in theory? And did not one of these very men, (Dr. Beecher,) the Chairman of the Committee appointed to labor with the erring brother, go, perhaps from this very meeting, and ask the blessing of God on the party which is about to elevate over all the people, the man who declares himself the *owner* of fifty of his fellow-men? Verily is not this the Church of Christ? and are not these men the priests of the most High God? Does it not behoove us to look well to our words; and when we remember the three millions of chattel slaves, and remember them if we can, as in bonds with them, and forgetting not that the judgment and consciences of the people are fashioned and educated by this so-called Church, does it not well become us to be careful, and use no word which the besotted times shall deem harsh,—at which the most fastidious delicacy shall start,—or the most morbid sensitiveness shudder?—G.

MR. JOHN JAY AND THE EMANCIPATOR.

The last Standard contains a letter from Mr. John Jay, President of the New-York Anti-Slavery Society, at the time the Emancipator was made over to it in April, 1840, giving his views of that transaction. His statement does not invalidate in any particular, on the contrary it confirms, the statements which have been made from time to time, in this and other papers, of the facts in the case. His object seems to be to give his opinion, and that of the Managers of his Society who assisted in this transaction, as to the *motives* which led to it. The Anti-Slavery and business public will give to their opinions such weight, as in view of all the circumstances of the case, they may seem to deserve.

This matter of the Emancipator is a simple matter of business and is to be looked at with the eyes of men of business, as such things are regarded in Wall street and State street. It is a question, as to the proper or improper management of funds by trustees or attornies. On the 16th of April, 1840, the Executive Committee of the American Society passed a preamble and resolutions to this effect, as quoted by Mr. Jay himself: "Whereas, *the financial condition of the Society* does not permit the continuance of the Emancipator in the hands of the Committee, the Publishing Agent be authorized to sell the Subscription books to the Executive Committee of the City Anti-Slavery Society," on certain conditions. Now, admitting for the argument's sake (which I utterly deny), that the Committee had a right to sell the organ of the Society, were its financial condition such as is here represented, without giving it notice, and affording it an opportunity of securing its property, it is very clear that the character of the transaction would, in that case, depend entirely *on the truth or the falsehood of the pretence of poverty* thus set forth. How were the facts. *At that very time the Committee had at their disposal, assets belonging to the Society,* STANDING IN THEIR OWN BOOKS, *at the precise sum of* EIGHTEEN THOUSAND, THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS, EIGHTY-SIX CENTS, ($18,350. 86.)!!! The sum necessary to continue the Emancipator for the three weeks, from the 16th of April to the 12th of May, when the Society, at its Annual Meeting, could have made provision for it, was *less than* THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS!! *At the very same meeting, April 16th, the same Committee voted to appropriate the sum of* EIGHT HUNDRED DOLLARS *to enable* Mr. BIRNEY and Mr. STANTON, *two of their own number, to make an excursion to England!* This money was raised, for those gentlemen sailed before the Annual Meeting. If the Committee could raise EIGHT HUNDRED dollars to indulge two of themselves in the pleasures of foreign travel, could they not have raised THREE HUNDRED dollars to continue the Emancipator for three weeks, till the Annual Meeting, when the Society could provide for its support, or dispose of it at its pleasure? WAS THIS PRETENCE OF POVERTY A TRUE PRETENCE OR A FALSE PRETENCE? Mr. Jay speaks of the deliberation with which he and his Board, acted in this matter, the counsel they took, their discussions of its various bearings, &c.; and affirms that they "acted as any other honorable men would have acted under similar circumstances!" Did these facts (*which have never been denied*) enter into their deliberations, and form an element in their decision? Had they not been partakers in the plot of the American Committee, to deprive the Society of its organ, could they not as easily have furnished that Committee with the necessary funds to carry on the paper for the American Society, as to have provided them on their own account?

Mr. Jay says, "Whatever difference of opinion may exist in regard to the authority of the National Committee, or the propriety of the course of the New-York Society, there ought to be no difference of opinion in regard to the *motives* of either party, unless proof can be adduced of a dishonest intent." Mr. Jay seems to me a little unreasonable in his demand that *we* should adduce proof of the intents and motives of the parties to that transaction; though, perhaps, it would be no difficult matter to do so. Mr. Jay is a lawyer, I believe, and must know that in law, as in common sense, a man is taken to *mean* to do what he *does*. All the State has to do is to establish the *facts*; the burden of proof lies upon the defendant, to show that his motives were good, and his action justifiable. A man may pick my pocket with the most religious motives of feeding the hungry, or of sending the Gospel to the Heathen, or the Bible to the destitute; but it would be rather hard to oblige me to take these motives for granted. The *onus* lies upon him, 1st. to prove that such were his motives, and 2d. that they constitute a sufficient justification of the act.

Mr. Jay bears his testimony, also, to the character of the gentlemen composing the conveying committee, and expresses his disbelief that they acted in that matter with any fraudulent intent. Let them have the full benefit of his good opinion. But if Mr. Jay has ever practised in a criminal court, he must remember that the strongest evidence of previous good character is never allowed to weigh against *proved facts* in a particular case. But when, in the same sentence in which he thus bears witness to the general character of the *defendants* in this matter, he undertakes to say that the *plaintiffs* have allowed "personal feeling and individual prejudice to supply the want of proof" in their charges against those parties, when all that they have ever done has been to state FACTS, WHICH NOBODY HAS EVER ATTEMPTED TO DENY, the knowledge of which is chiefly *drawn from their own record-book*, (not from their, or rather our, ACCOUNT BOOKS, which they have never permitted us to see,) his assurance is as extraordinary as it is reprehensible.

Mr. Jay says, authoritatively, "Whether the National Committee had an absolute authority to dispose of the Emancipator, or not, without the consent of the Society, the New-York Society had certainly a right to receive and hold it, until the Parent body disapproved of the act." I humbly conceive that the right of the New-York Society *to hold*, depended entirely upon the right of the American Committee to *convey*. If the Committee had no right to convey, there could be, properly speaking, no conveyance at all. The transaction was void *ab initio*. Mr. Jay's defence of the refusal of his Board to restore the Emancipator when it was demanded by its rightful owners, is perhaps as curious as the remarkable proposition just quoted. At an interview between a Committee of the American Society, and the Board of the New-York Society, it was urged that the Emancipator being the property of the American Society, the Committee had no right to dispose of the paper without the consent of the Society; "that the Committee had acted fraudulently in the transfer, and that the City Society had become parties to the fraud by accepting it;" and on these grounds the re-transfer was demanded. Mr. Jay says that the ground on which the New-York Society refused to do this, as set forth in a paper drawn up by himself, was, that if the *American Board* had no right to transfer the paper to the *City* Board without the consent of the *American Society*, then the *City Board* being in possession (whether honestly or fraudulently) had no right to re-transfer without the consent of the *City Society!* That is to say, if an agent of mine fraudulently transfers my property to the Directors of a Bank, they have no right to re-transfer it without obtaining the consent of the stockholders! The argument of the conferring Committee was virtually, that the transfer being fraudulent, was no transfer at all—that the property remained rightfully in the Society—and that they had a perfect right to repossess themselves of it without ceremony, if they could lay their hands upon it, at any time; and the demand for a re-transfer was merely a request to the New-York Board to put the Society in possession of its property with as little trouble as possible. So that his argument was as absurd in its particular application to their position as it would be in any parallel case in a Court of Justice. I trust, for the sake of Mr. Jay's professional reputation, that he does not often urge such an argument as this before the tribunals of New-York. It is edifying to learn, however, from the statement of Mr. Jay's Board, appended to his letter, that though they could not conscientiously re-transfer the Emancipator to THE AMERICAN SOCIETY, without the action of *the City Society*, they had no scruple, the next year, against transferring it to Mr. LEAVITT, *without any such recourse!!* Mr. Jay, indeed, was not a member of the Board at that time, but he expresses no disapprobation or surprise at the act.

The statement of the Board of the New-York Society contains the same testimony to the excellence of the characters and motives of the American Committee, and of their own, which Mr. Jay's letter contains. The only substantial variation in their facts, is, that the Board say that the reason why they could not re-transfer the Emancipator, at the request of the Society, was that *they had entered into a contract with the printers!* All these gentlemen seem to have forgotten that an informal offer was made by them to restore the paper to the American Society, PROVIDED Mr. LEAVITT SHOULD REMAIN ITS EDITOR! How their duties to their Society, or their obligations to their printer, would have been satisfied, had this proposition been accepted, instead of being contemptuously refused it is not my business to inquire. The coolness of the audacity with which these men describe their purchase of the Society's property, without consideration, and their sale of it to Mr. Leavitt, without money and without price, can only be equalled by that of that gentleman himself, when he says that, "IN SELLING THE EMANCIPATOR, AND IN TRANSFERRING THE OTHER PROPERTY OF THE SOCIETY TO TRUSTEES, THEY (THE COMMITTEE) ACTED AS OWNERS!"

These gentlemen conclude their communication with the modest hope "that it, with Mr. Jay's will be satisfactory to all who may have entertained doubts as to the propriety or wisdom of their course, and *put an end to the controversy on the subject.*" Mr. Jay, also, with much *naïveté*, protests against "the story being repeated a dozen times, year by year;" and exhorts us to let this matter "sleep in oblivion." In this wish he is joined by Mr. Leavitt, and all the gentlemen who had any part or lot in this matter. But, natural as their wish must be allowed to be, that these transactions should be forgotten, they can hardly expect that *they* can be allowed to be the best judges of the propriety or the expediency of keeping them before the public.—Q.

☞ The statement of the New-York Board contains a request that it be copied by such papers as have given circulation to the charges against them. Should any of them comply with this request, I demand, as an act of justice, that this rejoinder be also inserted by them.

THE ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

This Annual Bazaar deserves to be considered one of the institutions of the United States; and were we patriots, in the narrow sense of the word, we should beg foreigners to give our country credit accordingly. But it is to the credit of mankind at large, when any human being holds steadily to a holy purpose for eleven consecutive years, through good report and evil report; (the former often the most dangerous to holy purposes;) unwearied by toil, undismayed by opposition, uninfluenced by the flow of time, which wears away so many good intentions. We therefore feel free, seeing that this Bazaar is for the world's credit, and the world's benefit, to call upon all the world for aid as the time draws nigh. Especially to all Abolitionists we would say, in the words of Paul, "I entreat ye, true yoke-fellows, help those women which labored with me in the Gospel, whose names are in the book of life." For eleven years, neither treachery, nor selfish indulgence, nor vanity, nor forgetfulness, nor sinful self-distrust have had power over them to make them hold their names from the book of *this* soul-cheering existence. It is to them no self-denial now, no matter what they may once have counted it, or however the novice in the work may consider it. All other emotions seem unsatisfactory, insufficient, merely personal,

"Compared with these high feelings which inspire
The genius of the gift of Liberty."

What matters it to their hearts, or to the welfare of the slave, that what they do is little, if it be all they can? Is not the cup of cold water, given in the right spirit, still as significant of all that is good, and noble, and successful in life, as it was when the three friends of David hazarded their lives to draw it from the guarded well of Bethlehem, or when the Saviour bestowed his benediction upon all who offer it?

Let all, then, be up and doing. There are but about three months to pass between this time, and the week of the Fair. The prospect at present is that there will be a smaller, but more attractive exhibition than on any former occasion. A little zeal and diligence will remedy this deficiency in quantity, and make the amount equal to the beauty of the contributions. We heartily thank each and all, "jointly and severally" of the thirteen Anti-Slavery sewing circles in Worcester county, Massachusetts, who have announced to us their intention of coming to our help. How much their letters only have cheered and helped us, they can never know, till they too shall have labored for a decade, in all the discouragement of loneliness, and then begin to find that others' hearts are not of stone, but are ready to respond to theirs, if they will but overcome their disinclination to made the appeal.

An appeal like the one we have to make, who that would be thought human, will resist? It is for Freedom!—the basis of all other things;—the magnificent ground-tone in the music of human life, without which, life itself is as naught. Enjoying it ourselves, can we be so base as to find our happiness complete, while a slave calls vainly to us for deliverance!—that were to confess ourselves unworthy of the blessing.

☞ The LIBERTY BELL, our little Anti-Slavery annual, will be published as usual, at the time of the Fair. All of whom we have promise of contributions for it either literary or pecuniary, or who feel moved to aid it in either way, are requested to write or send *immediately*, to M. W. Chapman, 39 Summer street, Boston; as only an early preparation can ensure a satisfactory completion.

Donations of money, articles, and of materials of all kinds to be used for the Fair, are asked with confidence of all who feel the slightest interest in the Anti-Slavery Enterprise. It is not a sect, but a PRINCIPLE:—not a party, but a CAUSE. Address of the Committee, 142 Nassau street, New-York, Office of the American Anti-Slavery Society; or 25 Cornhill, Boston, Office of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.—c.

THE PENNSYLVANIA FAIR.

All that has been said above, with reference to the contemplated Fair in Boston may with the same propriety be said of the one to be held in Philadelphia. As the apostle of old said "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism," so say Abolitionists to-day, "One heart and one cause; one suffering and one joy." All contributions for the Philadelphia Fair should be sent to No. 31 North Fifth street, the office of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, or 142 Nassau street, New-York, office of the American Anti-Slavery Society.—c.

WALKER AND TORREY.

Are our friends doing all they ought and can in behalf of these two prisoners? Both need assistance and sympathy, but particularly the former; the latter has it already, to some extent, in the city where he is imprisoned, and the proper measures have been taken to do what the law can do. But Walker is where he has probably no sympathy, but, loaded with irons in his dismal cell, receives the execrations of all about him. I do not bespeak for these men the sickly feeling that only pities, but can do no more, but that active, living, heartfelt sympathy that shall move the people, and make itself felt throughout the country, even in that far-off Peninsula where Walker is imprisoned. They *dare not*, even in Florida, inflict the punishment of "*brand*, fine, and imprisonment" on this man, after his trial, if the North speaks out in the tone of indignant remonstrance and stern rebuke. But the North will do no such thing. It were idle to hope it. Drunken with the excitement of their miserable political squabbles, what care the people that one of themselves, a free citizen of Massachusetts, from just across the bay there from Plymouth Rock, lies in a dungeon, and chained like a felon,—and indeed, in his person the whole North chained, and all her rights stricken to the earth? I do not expect anything better of Whigs and Democrats than that they should tamely submit, as they always have done, to the overscerism of the South; but I marvel much that any one who claims the name of Abolitionist, and is not a mere partizan politician, striving for power under this name, but who does really love the cause of the slave, or even his own freedom, can hesitate to repudiate at once, and to pronounce his curse upon a Constitution under which such things are done, or consent for one moment to a Union which can permit such barbarities. Walker lies there, and his case is past praying or hoping for, unless the develish spirit which imprisoned him shall be driven from its prey by the only power that can reach him or them,—that of public sentiment. The Abolitionists must create this by calling meetings *everywhere*, not only in great towns, but in all the villages, and hamlets where there is an Abolitionist. There is no need to wait for speakers—do your own talking, and that must be a poor tongue that cannot wag in such a case. Meetings have already been held in Lynn, and in Harwich, by Walker's neighbors, and in other places. It was tried to have one in Boston also, but it was a miserable new organized abortion, which wanted to make some political capital, by managing every thing their own way, and inviting Garrison the last moment that it might be respectable. Let the other examples be followed, not only in Massachusetts, but in all the States, north of Mason and Dixon's line, and bring the question to an issue as far as we can, in the wretched pro-slavery condition of the North, whether a man is to be "*imprisoned, fined, and branded,*" for doing God service.

IMPORTANT POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The two important questions now under discussion between the two great political parties are,—who is the original Simon Pure Roorback, and was Mr. Polk's grandfather a Tory? On the settlement of these, particularly the last, seems to hang the fate of the Presidential election. The question, which before these came before the political world, and excited such intense interest,—namely, is Mr. Clay pious?—seems to have been decided in the affirmative: Mr. Clay *is* decidedly pious.

The argument of the Roorback tale is this: Somebody, under the signature of "an Abolitionist," sent to an Ithaca paper an extract from a work, purporting to have been written by Roorback, a German, in which it was related that the author had seen a coffle of slaves, a portion of whom belonged to James K. Polk, and were branded with his initials. It turns out that there is no such author, and that the extract published, was taken from Featherstonhaugh, excepting that relating to the branding, which is a base forgery. Before the truth was discovered, it created great excitement, and it is thought would have told materially on the election, so much was the tender humanity of the people shocked. It is held to be absolutely indispensible to the character of a President of this Republic, that his slaves should be "fat and sleek."

The other question: Was Mr. Polk's grandfather a Tory? still excites intense interest, and none the less because it has been positively settled both ways. The Whigs have produced a form of oath from a very rare history of the Revolution, never republished in this country, which, it is asserted, the said grandfather *must* have taken; and if he *did not* take this oath, it is triumphantly and conclusively asked, what oath did he take? The Democrats, on the other hand, assert that the said oath is a forgery; for none such is to be found in the aforesaid history. They moreover produce a letter from General Jackson, who declares that he knew the whole family of the Polk's for several generations, and shows conclusively that the grandfather in question was most decidedly a glorious patriot, and a father of his country, as well as a grandfather of James K. Polk. It is sincerely hoped by all good men, and lovers of our glorious institutions—peculiar or otherwise—that both questions will be definitely settled before November. They throw entirely into the shade the controversy which has been conducted with so much spirit in both Hemispheres from time immemorial, as to "who killed cock robbin?"

PENNSYLVANIA HALL.

I learn from the Freeman, that there is a project on foot to rebuild this edifice. Our friend Edward M. Davis, always ready in all good works, calls on the stockholders to come forward and unite in the undertaking. I trust there will be no hesitation about it, but that another Temple to Liberty shall be speedily raised in the middle of the mob-city, as an earnest of a better Future.

OBERLIN.—Among the graduates at the last commencement at this Institution, I observe the name of George B. Vashon, the son of our worthy and esteemed friend, John B. Vashon, of Pittsburgh. The Evangelist says, that were parts given at Oberlin, that which would have been awarded to this colored young man would have been of the highest rank. With talents of a high order, and a cultivated mind, his power of being, at this point of time, of signal service to his race, is very great. May he use his advantages aright.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."—A letter from a friend informs me that a banner with the above inscription, is hung across the street, in Gardiner, Maine, and remains there as a permanent standard of true Anti-Slavery.

☞ SUBSCRIBERS in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, will receive their bills with this number, for arrearages, and the current year. Will they attend to them immediately?

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

From Mexico.—By the schooner Fortuna, which arrived yesterday from Vera Cruz, we have received papers from Mexico to the 4th instant.

The aspect of the political horizon, instead of becoming clearer, appeared more threatening than ever.

An outrage of a most barbarous and serious nature is reported to have been committed on the person of a French sailor at Mazatlan. The affair has been communicated to the French Government by the French minister, who dispatched a messenger by the last packet.

Our readers may remember certain paragraphs in the *Diario del Gobierno*, censuring the Mexican Congress vehemently for their tardiness in voting the four millions required by the Government for the invasion of Texas. These attacks appear to have irritated Congress, as they are suspected to have emanated directly from Santa Anna. They have accordingly been formally repelled in a manifesto of considerable force and dignity, issued by Congress. That body not only conceived it necessary to reply to the violent tirades of the official, but addressing itself directly to the Government, demands satisfactory explanations of a course so offensive and scandalous, and requires a statement of the causes which have prevented the Government from interfering for the suppression of such abuses.

The President answers the manifesto of Congress in a manner which demonstrates pretty plainly his knowledge of, and acquiescence in, the offensive articles. He denies the right of Congress to interrogate him—declares that the language of the manifesto is that of a reprimand addressed by a superior to an inferior, and that he cannot recognize the existence of this inquisitorial power in Congress. He concludes by prostesting against the manifesto as illegal and improper.

Mr. Crescentio Rejou has been appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs, in the place of Mr. D. J. M. Bocanegra, on account of the ill health of the latter.

The *Diario* of the 21st ultimo, furnishes an account of a horrible disaster which has utterly destroyed the unfortunate town of Matamoras. The news is contained in a letter from the Alcalde, dated the 5th of August.—*New Orleans Bee, Sep. 9th.*

Texas.—The Natchitoches Chronicle of the 7th instant, confirms a report that President Houston has arrived at the scene of the recent disorders in Eastern Texas. He had called out the militia of Sabine and St. Augustine Counties, and had succeeded in capturing Walter Morman, the leader of the "Regulators." This individual was immediately put on trial on several indictments for treason and murder. The report that a pitched battle had taken place between the rival factions, is also confirmed. Sixty or eighty persons are said to have been killed. The *Chronicle* states that such has been the turbulent and violent conduct of these lawless bands for a year or two, that society on the frontier was completely disorganized, and the adjoining parishes of Louisiana kept also in a state of alarm. Among the outrages committed, it is reported that the "Regulators" pursued one of their victims into the parish of De Soto, and murdered him within a few miles of Mansfield.

General Items.

The people of Illinois are accused of a design to starve out the Mormons, and compel them to leave their city; provisions on their way thither are intercepted, and those having them ill-treated. The farmers are fearful of their lives being taken if they proceed in the direction of Nauvoo with provisions. Within a few days previous to the 14th instant, numerous Mormons have visited St. Louis to provide the necessaries of life. Such persecution of a people, for a difference of religion, is infamously wicked.

Trouble Brewing.—A letter from a gentleman at Springfield, Illinois, states that Governor Ford has issued orders for the march of twenty-five hundred Illinois militia and volunteers to Nauvoo, for the protection of that place. The detachment from Morgan County was ordered to rendezvous at Beardstown yesterday. No reasons are assigned for this new movement of the Governor, but, as it involves a very considerable expenditure to the State, it may be presumed that it has not been done without urgent necessity.

Since the above was written, the steamer Ohio arrived, which left Nauvoo yesterday morning, and reports all quiet there. So that we are at a loss to account for the cause of the Governor ordering out the troops.—*St. Louis Republican, September 3.*

We undestand that the "National Observatory" which has been erected by the Government on Camp Hill, under the superintendence of Lieut. J. M. Gilliss, of the Navy, has been completed, and is about to be turned over to the Navy Department.

This building is quite an ornament to the western portion of our city. It has been constructed, we believe, upon plans designed by Lieut. G. and contains the best and most valuable Astronomical, Magnetical, and Meteorological Instrument, and Library, in this country. These were procured by that officer, when in Europe, whither he was sent by the Government for the purpose of selecting and ordering the construction of such as were required for the Institution.

We are also informed that after the first of the coming month, Lieutenant GILLISS will be detached from the Observatory, having completed the responsible service with which he was specially charged to the satisfaction of the Government, and with no little satisfaction to himself.—*National Intelligencer.*

Dr. Poyen, the Mesmerizer.—We learn that Dr. Charles Poyen, who was for several years in this country, and who was the first decided teacher of the doctrine in New England died recently in Bordeaux in, France, as he was on the point of embarking for the United States.

Death of Abner Kneeland.—Abner Kneeland, well known throughout this country, died at Salubria, Iowa, on the 27th of last August.

Anti-Slavery Items

Suspected Slave Traders.—An examination has been made of the cargoes of the schooners Manchester and Devereux, of and from Baltimore, which were seized last week by order of the collector of Boston, on suspicion of being fitted out for the slave-trade; but nothing has been discovered to sustain the accusation. One of the schooners is a mere pilot boat; the other is larger, but they do not appear calculated to carry on the traffic to any considerable extent. It is admitted that their destination was the coast of Africa, but the captains declare that they only contemplated engaging in lawful commercial business. It is not a very difficult business for slavers to fit out at any port in the United States.—*Liberator.*

Gopher John.—The negro interpreter for the Seminoles, a short time since, had several rifle-balls fired at him, one of which killed his horse. He has sought protection at Fort Gibson, where he now remains.

Many opinions are prevalent as to John's freedom, we will mention that we have frequently seen his papers, and give this fact which we have gleaned from them. When General Jessup commanded the American army in Florida, he issued a proclamation in which he declared that all negroes among the Seminoles, bearing arms against the American forces, who would come in and surrender themselves to the American forces, should be freed from their masters. Under this promise, John came in and delivered himself up and was set free, and for several years afterward he served as an interpreter and guide to the American army operating in Florida. *Arkansas Intelilligencer.*

Lynching.—On Saturday evening, 31st ultimo, at the head of Vine street, Pittsburgh, some countrymen were encamped with their wagons, and had built a fire and prepared their suppers, when a man came along and made an assault upon them and their fixtures, by upsetting things and making a muss generally. A few rods distant he met a little old woman who was leading a child, and without a moment's hesitation he knocked both to the ground, and raised a stone which he threw at them, but luckily without taking effect. He was proceeding to throw another, when the countrymen noticed above rushed on and bound him fast. A gentleman who was passing on horseback saw the scene and joined the party, who were deliberating what to do with the villain. The rider, who had a large whip, said he would give them the free use of it until nothing was left but six inches of the handle, and after a few moment's consultation they concluded to give him Lynch law. They commenced at his feet and whipped up to his neck as he lay prostrate on the ground, then back, and then up again, the marks being about an inch apart. After rolling his body over three times, and operating in the same way all over him, giving him about three hundred lashes, he was permitted to go or to stay, as he pleased. He sneaked off rather the worse for wear. So says the Pittsburgh Commercial.

Died.

In Syracuse, WING RUSSELL, aged 44 years.

In the death of our friend, the community has met a serious loss. His active and enterprising character made him a valuable citizen, and his integrity secured him respect as a merchant. The rarer virtues of an enlarged benevolence, and a warm interest in the cause of reform, and particularly that of Anti-Slavery, endear his memory to those who knew him best. His heart and his hand were always open, and his kind hospitality will not be forgotten by those to whom the world sometimes denies a home.

In Chester county, Pa. on the 20th of the 8th month, JOHN WILLIAMS, of Stark Co. Ohio, aged thirty-three years.

NOTICES.

WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

It has been found impossible to make preparation for this Fair quite so early as was at first proposed, and notice of the time will be given hereafter. The friends of the cause are entreated to unite with fresh zeal, liberality, and industry, that the occasion may not fail to be what it now promises to be—one of great importance to the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, and of uncommon interest to its advocates. A few very beautiful articles from abroad have been already received, and donations of materials for making more; so that a large attendance on the weekly sewing meeting is more than ever desirable, as the time of the Fair approaches.

MARY WESTON,
SARAH H. COWING, } Com.

PHILADELPHIA FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

A stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at 7 o'clock, p. m. on Thursday, October 10th, at Clarkson Hall.

PHEBE EARLE, *Sec.*

BOSTON FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the Marlboro' Hall, No. 2, on the afternoon of Wednesday, October 9th, at 3 o'clock.

All women interested in the cause are invited to be present.

S. H. SOUTHWICK, *Rec. Sec'y.*

TO ABOLITIONISTS, AND THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the "Ohio American Anti-Slavery Society," held at Salem, September 8, 1844, William W. Brown was employed as agent for that Society, and authorized to hold Conventions, solicit donations, receive and collect pledges, &c. for the same.

LOT HOLMES, *Chairman pro tem.*

JAMES BARNABY, *Sec.*

GRAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION IN PORTLAND.

A grand Anti-Slavery Convention will be held in the city of PORTLAND, Maine, on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, October 4th, 5th, and 6th; and among the speakers who are confidently expected to be present, are Wendell Phillips, Abby Kelley, Frederick Douglass, James N. Buffum, and W. L. Garrison. The HUTCHINSON FAMILY are pledged to give their attendance. The friends of uncompromising abolitionism in Maine are earnestly invited to come in crowds to this Convention, which will, undoubtedly be one of transcendent interest.

AMERICAN FREE PRODUCE ASSOCIATION.

The sixth annual meeting of the society will be held in Philadelphia, on the 15th of Tenth month. To all persons interested in supplying themselves with productions free from the guilt of Oppression,—and to the members of the Anti-Slavery Societies, an earnest invitation is given to be present at this meeting. To the former that they may effectively aid in carrying on a work which they consider essential to secure a conscience void of offence toward God and man—to the Abolitionists who do not refrain from the use of slave labor products that they may learn—that in this UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, they are upholding a system which they wish to destroy.

JAMES MOTT, Ch'n. Ex. Com.

Philadelphia, 9th mo. 18th, 1844.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF EASTERN PENN SYLVANIA.

Dear friends and fellow laborers.—With hopeful hearts, we have commenced our preparations for our next annual fair, resolved that it shall be greatly superior to that of the last year. For the accomplishment of this purpose, we are dependent upon you. Will you not give us ample proof that we have not relied upon you in vain? You cannot need that we should offer you incentives to increased diligence and zeal in our common cause. The image of the suffering slave is vividly before your mental vision; and were you in any danger of forgetting the sad living picture, it would be frequently revived by some new odious manifestation of the slave power, or by the presence of the fugitive, crossing, in the haste of terror, your brighter path.

Nor need we present to you arguments in favor of this method of advancing our cause. You are aware that our fairs have been a source of great pecuniary profit, as the reports of the treasurer of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society show. The principal part of the profit derived from them have passed into the treasury of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, of which you are members. In asking your assistance, then, we are but asking you to aid our common cause, through the agencies which you have constituted. You have nobly responded to our calls, in other years. Have you not commenced our second decade with renewed ardor and increased self-sacrifice? Will you not evince it by immediately beginning, with us, preparations for the fair of 1844? Labor, each according to your ability or inclination, to let each do something. All marketable commodities, useful or ornamental, will be gratefully received. If our contributors will send, with their manufactures, a statement of the cost of the materials of each, the committee estimating the labor expended on them, will be careful to prevent any article from being sold at a price below its value. A very large part of the articles sold, yield a *fair profit*. If any of our friends in the country, will come and superintend the sale of their articles, they will be most welcome, and their aid truly valuable.

We are sorry to say that our poultry stall was not as well furnished as usual last year. Will not abolitionists who are preparing produce for their own tables or the market, remember, and give us a practical proof that they remember the physically and spiritually starved slave? Give to him, as God hath given to you, freely, abundantly.

We advise all who intend to work in this department, (and what abolitionist in Eastern Pennsylvania does not) so begin at once to do something, and enlist the sympathies and efforts of as many others as possible.

We are sure, dear friends, that none of us will regret having done too much, but we may regret having done too little for the emancipation of two and a half millions of slaves.

On behalf of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.

Anna M. Hopper,	*Maria M. Davis,*
Mary Grew,	*Emma Parker,*
Sarah McKim,	*Matilda Casey,*
Phebe Earle,	*Taressa Hallowell,*
Huldah Justice,	*Elizabeth J. Neall,*
Susan Dorsey,	*Rebecca Stackhouse,*
Gertrude K. Burleigh,	*Sarah Pugh,*
Harriet Snyder,	*Mary Shaw,*
Margaret Griscom,	*Sarah Dorsey*
Sarah M. Douglass,	*Margaret Jones,*
Harriet D. Purvis,	*Margaretta Forten,*
Hetty Burr,	*Esther Reckless,*
Mary T. Stickney,	*Jannette Jackson,*
Martha T. Carman,	*Elizabeth Carman,*
Mary Earle,	*Lydia Gillingham,*
Sidney Ann Lewis,	*Hannah Lee Stickney,*
Sarah Lewis,	*Susan Grew,*

Susan Shaw.

PHILADELPHIA, April 23d, 1844.

FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.

It is proposed to hold a series of conventions throughout the State of Ohio, this summer and fall, to spread Anti-Slavery light and truth abroad, and awaken the people to a sense of their responsibilities in reference to this all-important subject. We appeal to you, fellow-citizens, to your sympathies and sense of justice, for the means of keeping such men as Amos Dresser and Henry Bibb in the field; the one to show what we have to do with slavery, the other to tell of the wrongs and sufferings of the slave, (he having been one of the sufferers,) with pathos and natural eloquence that goes directly to the heart, awakening the tender sympathies of the soul and taking directly hold of the individual's conscience.

Shall they and all others be enabled to plead the cause of freedom and rebuke the wrong?

Shall tongues be mute when deeds are wrought,
That well might shame extremest hell,
Shall freemen lack the indignant thought,
Shall mercy's bosom cease to swell?
"Shall honor bleed, shall truth succumb,
Shall pen, and thought, and soul be dumb.
By all above, around, below,
Be our indignant answer, No.
"Up then in freedom's manly part,
From grey-head eld to fiery youth,
And on the nation's naked heart,
Scatter the living coals of truth."

Contributions and pledges can be handed to A. F. Hanna,

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE AGRICULTURAL FAIR.

Were ye at the Fair,—
Saw ye mony people?—Old Song.

The allusions to particular incidents, and localities, in the following lines, will be "caviare to the vulgar," but by many who were present at the late Agricultural Fair, at Poughkeepsie, they will be read with interest. The author I presume meant them for the public, and not for my private edification alone. I shall be pardoned, I hope, for correcting one or two probably *inadvertent* mistakes in orthography:

Come, listen all ye bachelors, oh, listen to our lay,
Ye "sentimental bachelors," so witty and so gay;
A cheering tale rizht merrily we'll whisper in your ears,
To raise your drooping spirits, and drive away your tears.
The power of writing "*rale stuff*," we know we don't possess,
For the muses deign but seldom our domicil to bless;
'Tis very true we now and then make some attempts to scribble,
And bread that's dipped in Castaly's fount, occasionally nibble;
But we ne'er have quaffed the *waters*, and few and far between
The visits of "the tuneful Nine," to our ladyships have been.
But when we write to *bachelors*, the words "come skelpin' in,"
Like country folk on Fair-day, with all their kith and kin:
We presume it is the *subject* that gives the inspiration,
And, trusting to its aid to-night, proceed to our narration.

For months before the time arrived 'twas known both far and near,
That the State would hold its annual Fair *not very far from here*.
The damsels young and matrons gray, looked forward with delight,
And "bonnie wee things, toddlin' round," hoped much to see the sight;
And we, though staid and dignified at every other time,
With the sound of the rejoicing hum could do naught else but chime.
At length the important day arrived, and dust-clouds filled the air,
But who cares aught for heat and dust, when going to a Fair?
The country folk came pouring in, in one continuous stream,
And *Michael*, Daniel, Job, and Seth, each with a well-trained team,
And scores of lassies, close packed in, came up to town that day,
With gladsome looks and joyous hearts, clad in their best array.
And sure it is a happy thing when holydays *do* come,
That people can forget their toils, and leave their cares at home.
Could we but view it as we ought, this beauteous world of ours,
With its glorious gleams of sunshine and its incense-breathing flowers,
Would whisper peace and comfort to every aching breast,
Send blessing to the poor man, and *hope to all the rest!*
But now a truce to sentiment—to our subject we'll repair,
And take you without more delay to the scene of the great Fair.

The building first we visited was called the Ladies' Hall,
Where needle-work and paintings were hung upon the wall,
Besides a host of other things too numerous to mention,
Betokening skill and industry, and worthy of attention.
We noticed there a graceful harp entwined with wreaths of green,
And by its side reclining, a flowery lyre was seen.
We sighed for gentle Terpsichore to touch the tuneful string,
And by her magic influence, sweet melody to bring.
But ah! the days long since have passed when mortals had the power
To summon minstrelsy divine into a lady's bower;
And had the charm been given us to woo "the tuneful Nine,"
'Twould have availed us nothing, for the strings were made of twine!
The genius who presided here was "*polished, sharp, and gay*,"
But there was one could *Bate-him*, though in a different way.
We tried to get a closer view, and mingled with the throng,
But the deafening cry, "Pass on, pass on," still hurried us along.

To the Floral Hall we next repaired to see the grand display,
When burst upon our astonished gaze, a Cornucopia!
The sides were bound with evergreens, with bright sumach between,
And pouring forth the luscious fruits of every kind were seen.
'Twas said by some, that at the first 'twas beautiful to view,
But had we not been *told* of this we should not think it true:
For when it met our wondering eyes it really "*beat all natur*',"
The Cornucopia was changed into an *Alligator!!*
The apples, pears, and peaches, were ranged both right and left,
And underneath were onions, and pumpkins of great *heft*.
Our sighs for grapes and nectarines we found were all in vain,
The policemen kept constant watch for fear they would be ta'en.
Their care for squash and cabbage-head was truly unavailing,
For had we wished, we might have found enough *outside* the railing.

And now we fear we tire you with this our lengthy poem,
So pass we on to building third—the Manufacturers' Home,
Where fabrics strong and beautiful were spread out for inspection,
For judges to award the prize, when they had made selection.
What think you is that curious thing, with walkers long and thin?
A boat propeller, did you say? Methinks it were a sin,
An encroachment on the rights of man, (and consequently *woman*,)
To set a boat to walking in a way so strangely human.
Preserve me from such folly—'tis sure a foolish plan
To give human limbs to water craft, and wooden ones to man.
Improvement's taking rapid strides—each day bring something new,—
Let's step in the next building, and see what's there to view.

Ye *poor forlorn old bachelors*, what brings you hither pray?
Just travel back and leave your room, for married folks, I say.
To see you promenading here, is truly rather comical,
What do you know of kitchen stoves, and cooking economical?
Poor Graham bread, and Adam's Ale, are good enough for you,
You certainly can ne'er expect the roasting piece or stew.
No, no, from these you are debarred—but try to be contented,
Though your *distressed*, and *lonely* state, is much to be lamented.
Enough of stoves and cooking—we'll travel o'er the ground,
And look at cattle, horses, and all that's to be found.
A noble object meets our view—a fairer sight I ween,
Than ever graced our village—drawn by a *splendid* team.
This Agricultural house was framed by an *angel*, some do say,
Who in the centre, graceful sat with her stars in grand array!
An *Angel* in an *Ox*-cart! Where, Romance, hast thou flown?
Far from these haunts we greatly fear thou hast forever gone.
Deign to return once more we pray, and cast thy mantle o'er us,
Or else we'll travel off in grief to Zembla or Mount Taurus.

On the last day all assembled beneath a spreading tent,
Where seats were raised for ladies, and where everybody went;
George Bancroft, the historian, delivered an oration,
And Van Buren, the Ex-President, created much sensation.
When the premiums were awarded, the motley crowd retired,
And each one to his home returned to tell what had transpired,
Wearied with much sight-seeing, right gladly we withdrew,
And now we make our curtsey, and bid you all adieu.

September 21st, 1844.

Miscellany.

From Graham's Magazine for January, 1844.

A CONTRAST.

BY MISS SEDGWICK.

The contrasts and disparities of life beset us at every step. We are startled by them, and we try to soften the pain they produce by the reflection that the inner does not answer to the outer world, by repeating, as we survey the gorgeous pomps and pampering luxuries that surround one condition, "all is not gold that glitters," and saying to the "meagre lead" of the patient poor, "here I choose!" And when the case is beyond this trite aphoristic comfort, our faith lays hold on the reverses of another life to solve the mysteries of this. Still there is an unsolved mystery, after all that observation, reason, and hope have done to aid us. The distance between man and man is frightful, even in the most favored parts of our favored country, where the institutions of government and the habits of society have done what they could to equalize condition. The scale does not run quite so high nor so low here as in the old world, where art is chained to the car of the rich and high-born, and industry and ingenuity exhaust their power to satisfy wants happily unknown to us. But here, some are born to affluence, to moral training and virtuous restraint, while others inherit poverty and vice, and all manner of abjectness. Some are endowed with an intelligence that ensures them progress; they are forever mounting upward on untiring wings, all life is bright to them. Others are imbecile from their births, feebly struggling, always disheartened, clogs to others, and burdens to themselves. One, with strong muscles and elastic step bounds onward, while a brother, heavily following on his crutch, gazes after him with a misty eye. One sister has an eye that can look at the sun, and the other sits in darkness which the sun never enlightens, and so it goes—the shades of being are infinite.

We cannot envy those who are unconscious of these contrasts, or insensible to them; and to those who are too sensitive of them we would recommend, instead of letting their sympathies run into repining, and despondency, to convert them into means of lessening these disparities into smiles, and gentle words, and kind deeds—into the generous concession of their own priveliges to the wants of others. The experiment of extracting sun-beams from cucumbers failed in the physical world, but in the moral world there is no material too stubborn to produce them, and no limit to their production—if we set about their manufacture in the right way. I made a short excursion up the Hudson, the other day, with a friend who has a kind of instinct for this manufacture. He is no political haranguer—he is no agrarian, no transcendentalist, nor partisan of Fourier—he is not even a professor of any of the noted philanthropies: but the seeds of whatever is best in their theories were sown in his nature, and, with some resemblance to what happens in the vegetable world, where, from the seeds deep laid in the earth's bosom, one set of productions follow another, so with him in the progression of years and occasions, comes the virtue suited to them. There is an ease and grace in his virtue that marks its origin. The arts of education produce, after all, but a clumsy imitation of that which the breath of the Almighty infuses. The goodness of rule and training and effort is very serviceable, but it is but an artificial light which may go out at any moment, and, at best, enlightens but a small and limited sphere, while a ray from the central sun is ever burning and all penetrating. But it was not with the intention of eulogizing my friend that I began, but to record one of those strong contrasts in life, which we observed together. We were on our way to visit a friend who has one of the loveliest villas on the river. We had left dear friends who were impatient for our return, and we felt that agreeable kind of self-consequence natural to those who leave behind, and go to something kinder than the kindest welcome of an inn. It was not a genial afternoon. The cold north wind came gustily down the river, threatening to blight the blossoming orchards that were now in their spring beauty along the banks, but we had plenty of coats, cloaks, and shawls, and, not caring for the caprices of the weather, we paced the deck, enjoying the freshness of the breezes, and marking the improvements on the very beautiful borders of the river. Here we observed new cottages, built with well-instructed taste, and there old ones repainted in softening colors harmonizing with green trees and gray rocks. There were various reformations and adornments that indicated the progress of landscape taste; and that art was beginning to study and follow nature. And surely she deserves such service here; where in every variety of mountain, rock, and woodland she is prepared for man's embellishment and enjoyment. An observer of the banks of the Hudson for the last three or four years, must notice a striking change and advance in its rural embellishments. The glaring white of the houses is giving place to colors healing to the eye. Instead of the hideous incongruities which money, without taste, produced in the hotelish-looking houses that seem to have been erected to glorify the painter and glazier, we have the graceful cottage, suggesting ideas of home, peace and contentment; and, in place of the *wooden*-Grecian colonnades, we have edifices springing up that remind one of the light and joyous Italian villa.—The landscape and flower-garden are surrounding these residences, and remind us of a beautiful remark of Dr. Downing, (to whom we believe is mainly owing this sudden improvement,) in his introduction to "Landscape Gardening." "As the first man was shut out from the *garden*," he says, "in the cultivation of which no alloy was mixed with his happiness, the desire to return to it seems to be implanted by nature into every heart." Truly it seems to be Mr. Downing's blessed mission to arouse and direct this love, and he must be dull indeed who should read this gentleman's very elegant works on landscape gardening and rural architecture, without feeling it to be his duty as well as happiness, to embellish the patrimony Heaven has bestowed on him, whether that patrimony be a principality or a half acre. Some of these thoughts occurred to us as my friend and myself steamed up the Hudson fenced against the too rude visitation of the winds, seeing and enjoying, going from one form of social comfort and happiness to another. And now for the "contrast" to which I have alluded. There was an Irish woman cowering down in the most sheltered place she could find on the deck. She had a teething baby in her arms, who, fevered and restless, was throwing its arms and legs out of the blanket shawl—the only comfort the poor mother seemed to possess—which she had taken from her own shoulders to wrap around the child. Her face was swollen and bound up for a growling toothache, and whenever she could pacify the fretting child, her thoughts evidently reverted to herself, and she became conscious of what Burns calls

"The hell o' a' diseases."

She took it, however, more meekly than he did, for, instead of kicking "the wee stools owre the mickle," she merely manifested her suffering by waving to and fro, and moaning in a low voice. Her husband bore her miseries—as husbands sometimes do their wives' philosophically. He sat at some distance from her, smoking and cracking jokes with a comrade, now and then tossing a pea-nut to the child, which the poor thing threw off loathingly. The mother did not utter an impatient word, but, casting a glance toward her husband and his boon companion, she said to me, "The men has it pleasanter travelling as the women does—don't you think so, ma'am?" But, "there's a difference in men—that's a fact," as I once heard oracularly remarked, and my friend, whose nerves vibrated sympathetically to the poor woman's, had gone in search of relief for her, and returned from the steward's stores with laudanum, camphor, and what not. The kindness at least was remedial. She was pleased and grateful. As we turned from her, we observed a little pilgrim from another land, a German boy, who had crept away from his mother, and was picking up the pea-nuts the sick child had rejected. The father, who had a younger child in his arms, reproved the little urchin's pilfering, and drew him back to his mother's side, a sturdy German woman, who looked rather amused than disturbed by her boy's misdemeanor. In this conjugal partnership, it was evident the husband did not monopolize the "pleasant times," but took his fair part in the burden of parental life. My heart warms to the German accent as readily as His Grace of Argyle's did to the Tartan, and I voluntarily approached these poor emigrants from a country rightly called a "father land." The amenity and kindliness of the man's countenance attracted me. It brought to my mind many a face that had cheered me when I was a stranger in his land, where the humanities pervade all classes. But, poor fellow, he had lost the cheerful look—the sun light that beams there from prince to peasant. He looked sadly weather-stained by the adverse storms of life. The atmosphere of this foreign land is apt to be a little agueish to the poor emigrant. Our new acquaintance talked English tolerably, and, as we manifested some interest in him, soon told us his story. There was nothing very strange or startling in it, but who ever will listen patiently to the true story of these poor seekers of a new home among us, will, we believe, cease to feel hostility to them.

Strass, for this was his name, had been bred to the trade of porcelain pipe making, as sure a trade in Germany as a shoemaker's is with us, for there everybody smokes, and the pipe being an article of general necessity as well as luxury, employs great numbers in its manufacture and vending. It is a work of fine art too; a German gentleman is as dainty in his pipe as a lady in her china. The principle of division of labor—austere in the old countries—utterly unfits persons, bred in some branches of manufacture there, for earning a living here. A poor Englishman, trained, as his father and grandfather were before him, to make the hinges of watch-cases, came here to ply his trade. The fashion of watch-cases passed away, and with it went the poor man's living. He and his progenitor's intellect, skill, and all had been worked into hinges. He could make hinges admirably, but nothing else, and this is the country for men of such flexible art as the Western genius, who was farming it one month, school-keeping the next, and, liking neither, took to engineering on board a Mississippi steamer. How soon it exploded we did not learn.

But, to return to our friend, Strass. We will let him tell his story in his own words, they being simpler and more forcible, and rather less liable to digression. In reply to my question, (a hospitable question, let John Bull growl at it as he will,) of how he liked our country, he replied—"Well—it is not home—the people are kind—but it is not home."

"How came you to leave your home?"

"Why, my brother had come before me, and he wrote, begging me to come after him, and telling how easy a good living might be got here, and how every body was free in the United States. It was just as I had been doing seven years' soldier's duty—had been 'seven years away from my wife, and here I thought I would be free to follow my trade, and ask no man's leave. My mother tried to keep me. I thought it was only her feelings—that's the way with young people, you know, ma'am. She offered me all she had if I would leave my girl with her—that one there—then my only one, but I could not. So we came—it's now three years last fall. Many a night, as I lay in the ship that brought us, I cried from night till morning, and when I got a moment's sleep I was at home again, and sorry enough to wake from it—my wife has a stouter heart, thank God, and she laughed at me. My only comfort was thinking of my brother, and how glad he, poor fellow, in this strange land, would be to see us—but when we got to New-York he was not there. I could not speak a word of English. I got the cheapest place I could find, expecting the little money left me would last till I got into business. But I soon found that was not coming in a hurry to poor Strass. Nobody uses porcelain pipes here—they smoke in nothing but Clay pipes, that cost a penny a piece—it is a pity to my mind—but there is no help for it. It was a hard winter in the city—more workers than work—my wife lying in with my second baby, that died, and I taken with a fever that came from a failing heart—our little money was every day growing less. I would not let my wife go out a begging with a basket, for I knew we should soon be ruined that way, so we kept on till spring. Then came my brother, thank God, and, finding me not fit for any kind of work, he said I should be a pedlar. So he sent me off with a well-filled pack, and as I could not speak any English, he wrote on a piece of paper such phrases as he thought would be needful for me. I came in a steamer to Newburgh, and then struck back into the country. For three days I did well. I kept my English paper in the German Bible my mother gave me, and it answered all the purpose. There was no question I had to ask or answer, my brother had thought of. It is strange, when one only says what's necessary, how very little is wanted. It seemed to me a wild wilderness land, being used, as you, ma'am, that have seen my country, know, to seeing villages as thick as the bunches of grapes on our vines. But I tried to keep up a good heart—the people were kind,—I have always found the Yankee people so. I got my meals and lodging for a trifle, at the farm-houses, and paid out of my goods. The fourth day, I began to feel I had gone beyond my strength—I had never quite got back my health from the fever—I had no luck that day—I travelled on and on, and found few houses and fewer buyers. At night I arrived, weary and chilly, my bones aching, and my heart aching worse, at a farm house, where there were three youngish women, and nothing of mankind about the house. They looked shy of me. I opened my pack to get out my tongue, as I called it, meaning to tell them I was not well, and to ask leave to stay there. I opened the Bible and the paper was gone—I emptied my pack—I shook out my goods, but no paper could be found—it was gone forever. My heart sunk, I folded up my goods, and tried to make the girls understand by signs. I offered them money, a sign that is easiest understood, but it would not do. I afterwards learned there had been a story in the newspapers of a German murdering a whole family in New Jersey, and the girls thought that all Germans would do the like—so the more I urged, the more they shook their heads and pointed to the door, and when I signed to thebarn, they looked one at the other, and shook their heads more than ever—poor foolish things! So I took up my pack and went tremblingly on my way. I soon saw a candle light from a house down in a little nook between the hills, a mile, or it might not be more than half a mile distant, for my legs moved heavily. O, what a sight is that little far shining candle when it comes from one's own house—or a friend's house—or if it be in one's own village, or country even; but, in a strange land, it's these pleasantest home things that give us most pain, I think."

Strass paused to hush the baby, wakening in his arms, and to say he feared his little boy, John, who was picking at some flowers in my lap, tired me. I assured him that neither John nor his story tired me, and he proceeded.

"Well, ma'am, I came to the house which looked somewhat neater than the common farm-houses. The dew was on the honey-suckles and roses, and they smelled sweetly about the door. I felt as if the sweet scent were God's welcome, and I stopped a minute on the door-step, and I knocked somehow with a lighter heart. A little lad opened the door for me, and with such a pleasant voice bid me walk in, that I understood perfectly; and when I came inside, his mother, who was sitting there with her little folks, motioned to me to sit down, and, seeing that I looked pale and faint, she told her children to drag my pack into the next room, and in five minutes she had made me a cup of tea, for the tea-kettle was waiting for her husband, and set a nice supper before me. My tears spoke my thanks plain enough—I had no need of my paper then. When my supper was finished, she opened a door from the kitchen into a little bed-room; and showed me I might sleep there. The children were like the mother—so kind. It seemed that they could not do enough for me—a little girl even set a rocking-chair for me, and put a cushion under my head. I should have been a new man, but that the thoughts of my lost paper weighed heavily on my mind. But surely the sight of such a family was a cure for the heart-ache, and just such a sight is not I think to be seen out of your country. A mother with six children about her, the oldest not more than ten, the youngest a baby in the cradle, living without a servant of any kind, and her house as neat as if she had a dozen of them, and she sitting down, with books, and maps, and pictures, instructing her children, and with a voice and manner fitting a prince's daughter. No—it's only in your country, ma'am, that the women can go from the bottom to the top of the ladder. I did what I could to please the little people—I opened my pack and showed them all that was in it. I tried to sing them a merry German song, but merry it would not be, for the morrow was before me without my paper, and I was going to bed, to worry about it all night, when the father came home. And he could speak German. I was rich then!"

It is hardly worth while to detail the farther particulars of his story. His new friend re-wrote the paper for him. He had since pursued his peddling career with a moderate success, and with singular honesty, as I inferred from his being now on his way to settle his family in some of the western counties, at the earnest persuasion of a neighborhood which he had supplied in all his pedestrian tours. Strass' face could not be mistaken. It marked one

"Whose honesty is not
So loose or easy as a ruffling wind
Can blow away or glittering look it blind;
Who rides his sure and even trot
While the world now rides by, now lags behind."

Would to Heaven that more in our country, foreign or native, high or low, deserved Herbert's quaint praise.

The evening was coming on, dark, cold, and frosty, when we arrived at Newburgh, where, on being dropped off the boat, we found our expecting host, with his most comfortable carriage awaiting us. A fifteen minutes' drive took us to his house, where, in spite of the cold evening, magnolias, acacias, laburnums, and a multitude of spring flowers were breathing forth upon us what friend Strass had aptly called "God's welcome." From a vestibule we passed through a hall, decorated with armor, crossbows, antlers, and various pretty antique things, into a library lit up cheerfully and most cheerfully by the smiling, earnest welcome of our hostess. In our country, where, let a house be ever so well appointed, the duty of looking after the arrangements for the guests falls on the mistress, a new comer does not feel quite tranquil till the face of the hostess is read, and if then, under the veil of courtesy, or dutiful concession to the rights and requirements of the husband, there is no suppressed worry, anxiety, or dissatisfaction of any sort, if instead of this there is a frankness, a spontaneous kindness, an evident merging of the disquiets and fatigues of the housewife in the enjoyments of the hostess, and, in addition to this, a certain graceful *laisser aller*—then is the welcome to a friend's house next best to the salutation of home voices.

And such was our reception from the hospitable mistress of ———, and hardly had I time to look around upon the tasteful fitting up of the library on the book-cases, sunken in the wall with oaken mouldings, and surmounted with a bust of the presiding genius of each department of literature, placed on one of Platt's prettiest brackets, on the pilgrim chairs, true vouchers that my hostess is descended from a Puritan ancestor, whose charter of nobility is as old as the Mayflower, and as firm as Plymouth Rock. On the fresh pots of rare flowers in the bay window, on—but to name each article of furniture, even where nothing was superfluous, would involve the temptation to description, for all were expressions of the refined taste of the proprietors, and before I had half time enough to satisfy my eye upon them, the door opened into the dining-room, where the fragrant tea invited us, accompanied with excellent cold meats, and certain preparations so delicate, that no hand less dainty than our hostess' could have compounded them. And from this scene of modest luxury, bright with happy human faces, my thoughts for a moment reverted to our companions in the steamer—to our poor Irish friend, who, when we shook hands with her, was still hushing her teething baby, and compelled to pass the night on the cheerless deck, and many a night in a dismal canal boat on her way to a solitary cabin-home in a strange land—and to Strass, with his little company, after a sail that had wearied us, unencumbered as we were, mounted in a lumbering stage-coach, to travel over broken spring roads—all night! three days and nights, as he told me, before he should reach his little lodge, where ne'er a porcelain pipe would come, nor a sound from the merry holydays of his father-land.

We conclude as we began; the contrasts and disparities of life are startling and painful. Should not the abyss between one condition and another, be filled up as far as may be by kind words and kinder deeds?

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

BY J. F. MURRAY, AUTHOR OF "THE WORLD OF LONDON."

The Upper House is a very proper and characteristic name for the House of Lords. The Commons' House is decidedly more common; the Lower House is certainly lower—we had almost said *low*; but to say that would be a breach of privilege.

Everybody has heard of the upper classes and the lower classes; these terms mark a well-known distinction in society; so do the Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament in legislation.

The upper classes are well dressed, quiet, gentleman-like, perfumed, silent, reserved, idle; so is the Upper House. The lower classes are slovenly, noisy, rude, blustering, talkative, busy; so is the Lower House. The one represents the elegant and artificial, the other the operative and essential parts of law-manufacture.

When a man quits a bear-garden or obstreperous public meeting, where everybody is talking, and nobody has anything to say, and gets into a Quaker meeting where nobody *will* say anything, he goes from the House of Commons to the House of Lords; when a man, retiring from the coffee-room of the Magpie and Stump, on a Saturday night, finds himself suddenly transported into a nobleman's drawing-room, he merely exchanges the Lower for the Upper House.

If the Lower House disappoints the stranger by its want of dignity and decorum, the Upper is no less unsatisfactory from the opposite defect; *there* all is frigid dignity and lordly indifference.

You are ushered, as it were, into the musicians' gallery of a *salon*, where a couple of dozen of respectable, grave, elderly gentlemen are assembling before dinner. The floor is covered with a scarlet cloth, the walls decorated with scarlet paper, the benches have scarlet cushions, with scarlet-cushioned backs; and, indeed, if it were not for the benches, and the scarlet, oblong, bed-like seat, called the woolsack, and the throne with its canopy, you would have nothing to distinguish the legislating room of the lords from the dining-room of my lord.

All is quiet and gentleman-like in this place; even the strangers in the gallery catch the infection of the noble atmosphere, and are afraid to look about them. The doorkeeper is a superior man, with a superior head, and a superior suit of black. He does not look like a House-of-Commons doorkeeper; he motions strangers to their seats with a gentleman-usher-like bow; he represses conversation with, "Hush, hush!" and never cries, "Silence!" with a strong voice, as do the doorkeepers of the lower gallery.

The doors open and shut noiselessly, and give ingress and egress to the Peers, who stand on the steps of the throne, or in the body of the House, or lounge on the cross-benches, the younger ones conversing in a low tone, the elder seated thinly here and there waiting for the commencement of business; some are perusing the petitions they have to present, or the printed paper of the notices or motion or other business of the day.

There is here seen no scrambling over the backs of benches, no mob gossiping at the bar, no slaps on the back, jokes, or horse-laughing: the Upper House smiles, whispers, and walks about without any tumult or noise. It also dresses better than the Lower House; no shooting-jackets, white hats, drab shirts, gaiters, or high-lows are worn by the Upper House; the most remarkable article of dress we have observed there being one *eternal* pair of plaid inexpressibles.

The Bishops, who look at this distance (we are now in the gallery) like a row of darling chubby children in their magpie robes, tremendous lawn sleeves, sit very modestly in a row by themselves on one of the back benches; we have no more to say of their spiritual lordships than that nobody in the House seemed to take any notice of their presence, and that, with few exceptions, they are uncommonly fat.

One noble lord appears to be asleep on the Treasury Bench, his feet stiffly stretched out between him and the table, a position which no peer takes the liberty to disturb by passing between; his single-breasted military frock is buttoned up to his chin; and his hat, concealing the upper part of his face, rests gracefully on the bump of his nose; he *seems* asleep, as we have said, but his attitude is that of a man asleep at "attention;" in fact, he is perhaps more wide awake than any man in the House.

Opposite, in the front seat, is a handsomely turned leg, encased in a killing pair of tights, which the noble owner looks down upon complacently, tapping at intervals a well-fitting boot with a silver-mounted riding-cane. A man of pleasing aspect, and a well bred *dolce far niente* face is Lord Melbourne, but not the sort of man nature seems to have intended for a Premier Minister.

A curious versatile nose is seen peering into the House, and presently a curious versatile Senator whisks after it. He hops about from bench to bench, as if he did not know where to settle, diving his hands into the pockets of a pair of chequered inexpressibles, too short and too tight; he grinds his teeth, scratches his head, rubs his curious nose, which resents the insult by twisting from one side of his face to the other; he seats himself on the woolsack, then jumps off, as if he had no business there; he runs up to, and seems to question peers on both sides of the House, and then runs away without appearing to stay for an answer; his movements remind us vividly of a very large rat in a very small trap.

While you are looking at him, the Chancellor enters, without state or noise, and, sliding on the woolsack, a peer rises to present a petition, the purport of which he states in an inaudible voice, and you are aware that business has begun.

A noble lord rises, and in a very subdued tone puts a question to the noble Duke who appears to be asleep. The noble Duke then, with great deliberation, takes his hat off his nose, rises, advances to the table, and in three words, uttered in a low, firm voice, answers, or declines to answer, sits down, puts his hat where it was, and appears to be asleep.

Some more questions having been put, and more replies elicited, of which the only impression remaining upon your mind is, how on earth the reporters can make anything of it, Lord Bruffy gets up (as usual) to inflict a speech.

It is impossible to conceive a more unfavorable place for an orator than the House of Lords; one would as soon think of getting up to make a speech in a catacomb. The thin, untenanted appearance of the House; the beggarly account of empty benches, reminding one of a provincial theatre on a benefit night; the evident apathy, listlessness, and indifference of the eleven peers who have nothing else to do but listen, and the impatience of the three Ministerial Lords, who know it is all "gammon;" the abstracted look of the unhappy Chancellor, who, after toiling all day in his court, wants to get home to prepare some important judgment; the yawning, stretching, and looking at watches (it now wants but five minutes to seven) would extinguish the fire of any orator (except Bruffy) that ever wagged a tongue.

The noble and learned lord begins; he is full of his subject, and is determined to work it off in speech. He dwells upon the importance of his subject, and solicits thereto the attention of the noble Duke. [The Duke moves one leg, as much as to say, don't imagine that I'm asleep.] He goes on, trying to warm; but the atmosphere of the House is too chilly, and his words seem to freeze upon his lips. He tries a joke; a sickly smile flits over the faces of one or two peers, which, in the Parliamentary reports of the following day, figures in parenthesis (a laugh). He becomes impressive, but there is nobody to impress; he is eloquent, but there is no sympathy. He might as well talk to the Elgin marbles, for any visible impression his eloquence appears to make.

At length he hits a sympathetic chord; he will no longer occupy the time of the House, (it is now half-past seven); his forbearance is rewarded with a distinct "Hear, hear;" peers seize their hats and canes, and two or three nearest the doors make off, anticipating the conclusion of the speaker. He concludes at last; the Chancellor slides off the woolsack, the peers disappear noiselessly, like shadows of Senators; and you go home thinking that, after all, the House of Lords is worth going to *once*, for the same reason that people have made voyages to the North Pole; for the discovery in short, that there is nothing to discover.

From the London Punch.

TO GOVERNESSES OF "DECIDED PIETY."

In the advertisement pages of *The Evangelical Magazine* for the present month, will be found the subjoined:

Wanted, a young person, *of decided piety*, about 22 years of age, to take the charge of, and educate, three children, under 12 years. She must be capable of imparting *a sound English education, with French and Music!* Any one *who would feel anxious for the welfare of the children*, will be treated as *one of the family*, and may realize the comforts of a home. *Salary 8l. per annum.* Every application must contain real name and address, (post paid). Direct G. I., at Mr. Bruce's, Stationer, Trumpstreet, Kingstreet, Cheapside.

There is little doubt that "G. I." will obtain an instructress, "anxious for the welfare of his children;" at least equally anxious as their devoted parent, seeing that he is ready to sacrifice "8*l.* per annum," that is 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* per head, for their sound English education with French and Music!

There is certainly this little alloy in the golden offer; namely, that the governess will absolutely be treated as "one of the family;" for, reader, consider *what* a family!

However, "G. I." by his yearnings for "decided piety," has interested us. We are anxious that, for his magnificent 8*l.* per annum—(by the way, what may he give the boy who cleans the knives and forks?)—he should have the very best instruction for his babes purchaseable by so liberal a sum. There is much philanthropy as well as paternal love in this 8*l.* per annum; every shilling of it speaks the benevolence of "G. I." Yes! we hear at least one hundred and sixty silver voices, crying altogether, "What a Christian!"

Let us consider what sort of reading, in the way of an English education, would harmonize with the apparent spirit of "G. I." as developed in his advertisement. Would not daily lectures on the beauties of Elijil comfort the parental heart? And if he have not foreswon the drama as a pestilent thing, might not an occasional reading of the *Hypocrite*, with a frequent disquisition on the worldly wisdom of the excellent Mr. Schrooge, be, in the judgment of "G. I." admirably adapted to form the mind of his children after the excellent model of their father?

As for French, we propose a frequent reading of that part of Gil Blas, in which Ambroise de Lamela so often visits a church that he may more securely rob his master; together with a frequent perusal of Robert Macaire, in all his inimitable ingenuities.

And next for Music: let the governess, at £8 per annum, choose for her general theme, the air of "*This cold, flinty rock*," occasionally varied with, "*He was despised among men.*"

Excellent "G. I.!" Would we could have his portrait! Yet, wherefore the wish? Do we not see him, ay, as plainly as the ink-marks before us? Does not the reader behold him? Nay, peruse his advertisement once more; and now is he visible in the sheet, as though done by Jack Leech himself. Look at him! Hath he not a sulpher-tinted cheek—a crop of hair, smooth and shining as court-plaister, over his inch-deep brow—and an eye expressly made to shudder at carnal sins and bad shillings!

And this very man is of the set of men who, believing they believe in the Bible, think the human heart is poor worldly vanity, altogether extra of the sacred book. They have every respect for religion in a fine large type, but for the daily religion between man and man—for that sense of justice which abhors oppressive chaffering with the needy—that refuses to drive its hard, relentless, Shylock bargain, with female dependence—oh, that is a feeling out of their creed, a something for the scribblers of romance and the writers of profane verse to rave about!

Yet, doubtless, is "G. I." a devout Christian. Yes, sure we are, that after a charity sermon at the Magdalen, he would meekly hold the plate at the door, sweetly unconscious of the victims that such as he, with their Pharasaic "piety," drive to a soul and body-killing commerce in the dreadful street.

Anecdote of Dr. Johnson at Oxford.—Lord Eldon's Anecdote Book has the following reminiscence of Dr. Johnson at Oxford:—"I had a walk in New Inn Hall Garden with Dr. Johnson, Sir Robert Chambers, and some other gentlemen. Sir Robert was gathering snails, and throwing them over the wall into his neighbor's garden. The Doctor reproaced him very roughly, and stated to him that this was unmannerly and unneighborly. "Sir," said Sir Robert," "my neighbor is a Dissenter." "Oh!" said the Doctor, "if so, Chambers, toss away, toss away, as hard as you can."—*Horace Twiss's Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon.*

A Genuine Bull.—An Irish paper lately gave an account of a duel, and announced the result of the meeting in these words: "The one party was wounded severely in the chest, and the other fired in the air." Query, who wounded the sufferer? *Portland American.*

Graham House, 63 Barclay St.

CITIZENS, or transient visitors desiring a quiet home, where a real Temperance diet is proffered them, consisting of Vegetables, Fruits, &c. without stimulants or flesh meats, are invited to patronize this house. Terms moderate. Shower-baths free.

August 8. ROSWELL GOSS.

Books,

For Sale at the Office of the American A. S. Society, 142 Nassau St. N. Y.

THE LIBERTY BELL of 1844, an Annual, published for the Massachusetts Fair, and consisting of various original articles, from the ablest Anti-Slavery writers in this country, Great Britain and Ireland.

XIMENA, AND OTHER POEMS, by *James Bayard Taylor*. Philadelphia, 1844.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES, or a true picture of the AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY, by *S. S. Foster*; and various other standard Anti-Slavery works.

New-York, July 4, 1844.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by Alexander Hamilton; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall b up himself against the hypocrite.—*Job.* xvii. 8.

Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels, and the worst of fallen men.—*Wm. Penn.*

NARRATIVE of the Proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and their Subsequent Confirmation by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper.